DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 809 SP 015 327

AUTHOR Arbuckle, Margaret: And Others
TITLE Documentation/Evaluation: University of Maine, Farmington/Greenville. Teacher Corps Project. June 1977-June 1979.
INSTITUTION New England Teacher Corps Network, Portsmouth, N.H.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 79
GRANT G0077-00127
NOTE 330p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies: Consultation Programs: *Delivery Systems: *Demonstration Programs: *Educational Change: *Educational Cooperation: *Educational Strategies: Individualized Instruction: Inservice Teacher Education: Linking Agents: Needs Assessment: Postsecondary Education: Preservice Teacher Education: Program Evaluation: Rural Schools: *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

The Greenville Teacher Corps project developed a model demonstration of a field based teacher education program designed to provide both preservice and inservice training to a rural and isolated region in northern Maine. The project was designed to be responsive to local needs. Collaboration and participation of all constituents was central to the operation of the project. Major project goals included facilitating linkages between the University and the Greenville community: enabling the University to develop a field based graduate education model: and developing and installing a K-12 individualized instructional program. Accomplishments of the project are clearly evident. The Teacher Corps project was directly responsibile for the delivery of a number of important services. (JN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED196809

# DOCUMENTATION/EVALUATION

# UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON/GREENVILLE

## 12th CYCLE

### TEACHER CORPS PROJECT

### JUNE 1977 – JUNE 1979

DR. MARGARET ARBUCKLE

SP015327

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted by:

Sara R. Massey, Executive Secretary
New England Teacher Corps Network
PO Box 1065
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Indicator: Teacher Corps

This material was supported by Grant No. G0077-00127 U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Points of view or opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by USOE should be inferred.

# DOCUMENTATION/EVALUATION

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON/GREENVILLE

TEACHER CORPS PROJECT

JUNE 1977 - JUNE 1979

Dr. Margaret Arbuckle

# PREFACE

This report was prepared by Margaret Arbuckle with assistance from Barney Keenan and Betty Stead. The author would like to thank Greenville school personnel, community persons, and IHE faculty who contributed to this document through sharing of thoughts and feelings about the Project in personal interviews conducted throughout the past two years. Thanks also go to Project staff who assisted in documentation and special thanks to Betty Stead for typing and editing a paper that kept growing and to Barney Keenan for his assistance with documentation, commitment to this report and for staying with it through its completion.

Margaret Arbuckle
Project Consultant
Box 64
Kingfield, Maine 04947
(207) 265-2796

CONTENTS


| | | Page(s) |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 - 2 |
| II. | OVERVIEW OF PROPOSAL | 2 - 9 |
| III. | REALITIES | 9 -144 |
| | A. Management | 9 - 25 |
| | 1. Staff Selection | 9 |
| | 2. Committees | 9 - 12 |
| | 3. Leadership/Accountability | 12 - 13 |
| | 4. Roles and Responsibilities | 13 - 17 |
| | 5. Decision Making | 17 - 18 |
| | 6. Goals/Planning | 18 |
| | 7. Collaboration | 18 - 20 |
| | 8. Communication | 20 - 22 |
| | 9. Evaluation/Documentation | 22 - 25 |
| | B. Needs Assessment | 26 - 28 |
| | 1. Inservice Component | 26 - 27 |
| | 2. Community Component | 27 - 28 |
| | 3. Pre-service Component | 28 |
| | 4. University of Maine at Farmington | 28 |
| | C. Design, Delivery and Evaluation of Services | 29 -101 |
| | 1. Inservice Component | 29 - 70 |
| | 2. Community Component | 70 - 87 |
| | 3. Pre-service Component | 88 -101 |
| | D. Role Group Perspectives | 101-113 |
| | 1. Greenville-Community | 101-105 |
| | 2. Greenville-School | 105-109 |
| | 3. University of Maine at Farmington | 109-113 |
| | E. Problems/Concerns | 113-129 |
| | 1. Staffing | 113-114 |
| | 2. Management | 114-116 |
| | 3. Communication | 116 |
| | 4. Collaboration | 116-117 |
| | 5. Splintered Staff | 117 |
| | 6. Slow Start/Process vs. Products | 118 |
| | 7. Visibility of Dollars | 118 |
| | 8. Lack of Follow Through | 118 |
| | 9. Needs Assessment | 119 |
| | 10. Staff Development - Secondary | 120-121 |
| | 11. Consultant Role | 121-122 |
| | 12. Field-Based Instruction | 122-124 |
| | 13. Master of Education Program | 124-125 |
| | 14. Intern Program | 124-125 |
| | 15. Individualization Program | 126 |
| | 16. Inservice Efforts | 126 |
| | 17. Local Staff Development Process | 127 |
| | 18. School-Community Linkages | 127 |
| | 19. Multicultural Component | 127-128 |
| | 20. Lack of Institutional Support | 128 |
| | 21. Evaluation | 128-129 |
| | F. Accomplishments/Impact | 129-144 |
| | 1. Greenville-Community | 129-132 |
| | 2. Greenville-School | 132-136 |
| | 3. University of Maine at Farmington | 136-144 |
| IV. | ORIGINAL PROPOSAL/ACTUAL OUTCOMES CHART | 145-155 |
| V. | LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS | 156-161 |

DOCUMENTATION/EVALUATION
GREENVILLE/UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT FARMINGTON
TEACHER CORPS PROJECT
JUNE 1977 - JUNE 1979

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Teacher Corps staff entered Greenville, a remote and beautiful, rural community in northern Maine, in the summer of 1977. Their intent, to develop and implement inservice programs and activities in Greenville in a collaborative, needs responsive manner, through the linkage of University of Maine at Farmington (UMF) resources with the Greenville community. At the closure of the two year Project, as at its start, reactions were mixed. Some people were profoundly affected by the Project, others had nothing to do with it. Some thought it was the best thing to happen to Greenville in years, and others felt it was harmful and wish it had never come. Some were grateful for the resources Teacher Corps monies had provided and others were resentful of what they consider a waste of taxpayers dollars and another federal ripoff. Many persons were glad the Project came to Greenville and also glad it went.

Change is a turbulent and difficult process, particularly in a Project such as this which attempted to respond to the needs of diverse role groups (UMF/community/school/administrators) with very different and often conflicting needs and perspectives. Assessment of needs and implementation of strategies to meet these needs is easier said than done: the gap between conceptualization and implementation of plans is enormous. Collaboration, a key ideal underlying the Project, is a sophisticated process which assumes certain skills on the part of the participants. Many, if not most, did not possess these skills. In addition, Greenville has a culture of its own: the Project staff, as members of a federal Project were viewed as aliens in spite of the fact that three staff members had lived in the area eight years to a lifetime. Acceptance of outsiders takes time. On top of all this was the pressure of producing real and viable changes in two years time, an unrealistically short time period. Given the complexity of the Project, it's not surprising that it was difficult. In addition to difficulties inherent in the nature of the Project, some real blunders were made and problems emerged.

However, accomplishments of the Project are also clearly evident. The Teacher Corps Project was directly responsible for the delivery of a plethora of services and materials - including a master's program - which was previously nonexistent; personal and professional growth of local and Unversity persons who participated in the Project; the emplacement of a school-community council; the initiation of a local staff development process; a comprehensive town assessment; and linkages with a wide variety of agencies/ organizations in and out of Maine.

I. INTRODUCTION - continued

The purpose of this report is to present a comprehensive overview of the UMF/SAD #2 Teacher Corps Project over its two year life span; to trace its development, rationale for development, and its closure. Project accomplishments are examined as well as specific problems. The intent of the report is to present a realistic and constructive view of a difficult Project. The report concludes with learnings/recommendations to other change projects. Sources of data include all Project documentation, personal interviews with Project participants from all role groups, and observations of selected meetings. Personal interviews with Project staff were conducted in October 1977, September 1978, January 1979 and May 1979. Participants from UMF and other campuses were interviewed in December 1977 and May 1979. Randomly selected community persons were interviewed in January 1978 and again in May 1979. The total school population was interviewed in May 1979 and all PSC members were interviewed in June 1979. School and UMF administrators were interviewed in December/January 1977/78, September 1978, and May 1979. Observations of staff meetings and Project Steering Council (PSC) meetings were made in October 1977; January, October, November, December 1978; and March, April 1979.

II. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSAL

A. Background

As with most proposals, the Greenville/UMF proposal started with the idea of a single person and then expanded to involve persons of the appropriate institutions, in order to make it suitable for funding. Documents indicate that development of the proposal was carefully planned and researched. The idea originated with a member of the State Department of Education who was the primary mover of the proposal and later hired as the director. He spent time vacationing in Greenville in the summer of 1976 at which time discussions were held with Greenville people, including the assistant principal and the superintendent. This, in fact, served as an informal needs assessment. Discussions were also held over the summer with the Dean of Education at UMF who involved three other faculty with appropriate grant writing skills.

In September, the decision was made to initiate the proposal development process and each of these five persons subsequently wrote a portion of the proposal. Several possible sites were discussed and Greenville was selected due to its distance from the University (to see if they could deliver programs to remote areas) and because the district's schools are located in one site. These characteristics apparently made Greenville more suitable for funding than some other districts. It was also in line with a recently stated (February 27, 1976) concern/need of the University of Maine at Portland Gorham (UMPG) to "concern itself with extension of degree programs to meet needs throughout the state." Incentives for University involvement included the challenge of seeing whether or not it could deliver programs to remote areas, in direct monies, and support for delivery of a graduate program through UMF.

II. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSAL

A. Background - continued

The three proposed program thrusts, (which were identified as early as October in the preliminary draft of the UMF application,) with a M.Ed. concentration in exceptionality, were identified in response to what UMF could deliver, stated State needs and the informal assessment of Greenville done over the summer.

On November 10, 1976, a State Department of Education consultant and the Dean of Education at UMF met with the superintendent and two board members to discuss possible involvement in the Teacher Corps program. Involvement was then discussed with the school staff. According to the principal a majority of the staff indicated a positive response toward such a program. The stated goals of the Project at that time were: 1) to provide onsite inservice programs for SAD #2 faculty, 2) to provide an opportunity for interested faculty to work on a master's degree in teaching without attending the University for a major portion of their degree credit, and 3) to provide a site for the training of four teacher interns.

On December 7 the board voted to approve involvement of the district in the Project. Specific information regarding Greenville and Greenville's needs was then incorporated into the proposal which was not actually completed until April.



In February 1978, the GEA complained that there had not been teacher involvement in the development of the Project proposal and that the proposal had been formulated without consulting teachers. Official approval from the Greenville Teachers Association was requested and obtained. The proposal was completed in April.

B. A summary of the Project and its major goals, as set forth in the proposal, is presented below.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The UMF/Greenville Teacher Corps Project proposes to develop a model demonstration of a field based teacher education program, designed to provide both pre and inservice training to a rural and isolated region in northern Maine. The major principle governing the developmental process is that the model to be emplaced during the Project life-span (1977-79) must be responsive to locally assessed needs. Collaboration and participation of all constituents is central to the operation of the Project. The program development process calls for:

1. Real involvement of all major constituents in the governance and operation of inservice programs;
2. The development of inservice activities that are responsive to both teacher and program needs;

GENERAL OVERVIEW - continued

3. A needs assessment and program development process that is open and public;
4. A more comprehensive role for the professional in the initial training of preservice teachers and for the teacher educator in the continuing training and renewal of teachers out in the field.
5. Community education and participation.

The Project focuses on three major training thrusts dealing with critical issues plaguing Maine schools:

1. Diagnostic prescriptive teaching of basic skills;
2. Alternative school and curriculum designs;
3. Mainstreaming skills for the regular classroom teacher.

MAJOR PROJECT GOALS

1. To provide the University of Maine at Farmington with an opportunity to develop, implement and evaluate a replicable, field-based graduate education model in elementary and secondary education that is responsive to needs identified by local schools and communities and is specifically directed towards regions that have limited access to universities and related supportive facilities.

2. To facilitate linkages among departments and individuals at the University of Maine at Farmington that will allow the University to be increasingly responsive to pre and inservice training needs of teachers of rural disadvantaged children in Maine.

3. To develop and implement a preservice program preparing four interns for work in rural communities with high concentrations of disadvantaged children and limited access to supportive services and training facilities.

4. To develop and implement a graduate level inservice program for teachers of rural disadvantaged youth, in SAD #2, which is exportable to other regions with limited access to university and related supportive facilities.

5. To provide pre and inservice teachers in Greenville with training to develop competencies in the areas of (a) diagnostic/prescriptive teaching of basic skills, (b) alternative organizational and curriculum designs, and (c) mainstreaming in the regular classroom (exceptionality.)

6. To facilitate increased interaction between the school and the community for collaborative decision making regarding (a) school problem solving in general, (b) inservice and preservice teacher education in particular, and (c) the installation of a community-based education design and to establish permanent linkage between the school and the community.

7. To develop and install a K-12 individualized instructional program designed to meet the needs of the student, the school system and the community at large.

8. To provide the school and the community with necessary skills and resources which would allow the schools to develop and test a range of staff development models and put in place the model which best fits the needs of the students, the staff and the community.

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

1. University

(a) The University of Maine at Farmington in cooperation with the Greenville public schools will have trained at least four interns to assume teaching positions in rural areas with high concentration of disadvantaged children.

(b) The University of Maine at Farmington in conjunction with the Greenville public schools will have provided field-based graduate level inservice training to at least 25 teachers in the areas of exceptionality diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of basic skills and alternative teaching strategies and approaches.

(c) A graduate level inservice training program for rural regions will have been developed and field tested. Such a program should be exportable to other rural regions with limited access to universities and related supportive facilities.

(d) Linkages among departments and individuals at the University of Maine at Farmington will have been established that will allow the University to be increasingly responsive to preservice and inservice training needs of teachers of rural disadvantaged children in Maine.

2. School-Community

(a) The Greenville public schools in conjunction with the community of Greenville will have established and placed in operation a steering committee adjunct to the local school board designed for collaborative decision making and hence, to respond more directly to local school problem solving needs.

(b) The school program will have permanent linkages between the home and the community which will be aided by the teachers, interns and volunteers trained within the framework of the proposal.

(c) The installation of a K-12 individualized instructional program personalized to meet the needs of the student, the school system and the at-large community of Greenville.

PROCEDURES FOR REACHING PROJECT GOALS

1. Needs analysis

a. Assessment of University resources

b. Assessment of inservice training needs and competencies in the three program thrusts, as perceived by SAD #2 classroom teachers, by school administrative personnel, by University personnel, and by local students and members of the community.

c. Assessment of needs in a rural setting which are related to field based preservice teacher education programs.

d. Assessment of needs in a rural setting which are related to community based education concerns and potential avenues of participation by the community at large.

PROCEDURES FOR REACHING PROJECT GOALS - cont.

The basic thrust of the assessment efforts is to be through client self-assessment and identification of needs for further training and learning.

2. Development and Implementation of Instructional Programs

The design of programs will be dependent on the results from the needs analysis. The following types of activities will characterize this phase of the Project:

a. Identification of Learning and Staff Development Objectives. Both interns and teachers will select teaching objectives, based on needs assessments. It is anticipated that some objectives will be individualized and others will involve groups of teachers.

b. Instructional Programs
It is anticipated that the following on site delivery vehicles will be used:

(1) School Problem solving Seminars and Workshops
(2) Individual Professional Development
(3) Formal Courses
(4) Mini Courses

c. Establishment of a Teaching Center
Such a center will contain professional and curricular materials and will also facilitate informal sharing of ideas and teacher made materials. It is proposed that this center serve as a focal point of interaction between UMF faculty, teachers, community persons and students.

d. Implementation of Instructional Alternatives for Students.

MANAGEMENT DESIGN

1. The proposed management system is designed to manage a change process and provide for ongoing constituent role feedback, as well as decision influencing. It relies on an evaluation system designed to serve as a management tool providing data for ongoing shaping and reshaping of Project management decisions. The management system is patterned after an MBO model, calling for identification of Project goals, target(s) for change, innovation(s), outcome(s), staffing assignments, and resource allocations.

2. The proposed management structure is intended to provide for maximum collaboration among all constituent role groups in the decision making process. The structure contains the following key elements:

a. The Project Steering Council (PSC) will serve as the prime governance body for the Project. It is responsible for formulating the policies for operation of the Project and for coordinating the roles and functions of the University faculty, school district staff, and community groups. The council is composed of representatives from the following groups: SAD #2 teachers, SAD #2 administrators, SAD #2 Board of Directors, the

MANAGEMENT DESIGN - continued

Maine Teachers Association, parents, community, the SDECS, UMF, and the intern team. The Director of the Project is to serve as executive secretary for the committee.

b. In addition to the PSC, the following sub-committees composed of representatives from varying school and community groups, will serve primary functions in determining Project activities and directions:

(1) The School-Community Council will oversee the entire Project, interact with community organizations and remain as an ongoing coordinating group following withdrawal of the Teacher Corps after the current funding period. Guidelines for membership of this council are still to be determined.

(2) The Committee on Community Education, composed of five community people, two teachers, two students, and one core faculty member, will be responsible for identifying community needs, recommending priorities, and developing programs and activities to meet these needs and priorities.

(3) The Committee on Inservice Teacher Education will be responsible for identifying needs and planning and developing all components of the inservice program subject to the approval of the PSC.



The memebership of this committee will be four teachers, one core faculty member, two community representatives and two students.

(4) The Committee on Preservice Teacher Education will identify needs and plan and develop all components of the intern program subject to the approval of the PSC. Four cooperating teachers, four interns, one core faculty and two community persons will comprise this committee.

3. Project Staffing

a. The Project Director will be a member of the UMF faculty and will be responsible to the Dean of Education. The Director will be responsible for the over-all administration of the Project according to the policies established by the PSC, and will have teaching and/or administrative experience in public schools and higher education.

b. The Program Development Specialist will be a member of the UMF faculty and responsible to the Project Director for his/her assigned responsibilities. This person will have demonstrated competencies in the general area of inservice staff development and will have p public school experience and in-on and off-campus-teacher education.

c. The Core Faculty will have expertise in one of three areas:
1. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of basic skills K-12,

3. Project Staffing - continued

2. Alternative organizational and curriculum design K-12
3. Teaching of the exceptional child in regular classroom K-12 and will qualify for both graduate and undergraduate faculty status.

d. The Community Coordinator will be a member of the SAD #2 staff and appointed by the local school board. This person will be experienced in community education and/or community activities and will be responsible to the local superintendent through the Project Director.

e. The Team Leader will be a member of SAD #2 appointed by the local school board. The team leader will be responsible for the intern team and the on-site intern program and will have public school experience in curriculum development and inservice teacher education.

EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION

1. Evaluation

Evaluation for the purpose of the UMF/SAD #2 Teacher Corps Project is perceived as a mechanism to affect decision making about the usefulness and/or relevancy of what has been done. It will be our intention to utilize the evaluation process to accomplish three major goals:

a. to find out what is effective and what is not effective about the Project;



b. to make judgments about the relevancy of the proposed Project in terms of the thrusts and processes;

c. to accumulate sufficient data which might lead to the reinforcement, modification, and/or refocusing of the proposed Project thrusts.

Four types of evaluation will be conducted:

a. Context Evaluation to define the specific environment, unmet needs and problems underlying these needs.

b. Input Evaluation to identify and assess the relevant capabilities of the institution (UMF) that is implementing delivery strategies.

c. Process Evaluation to generate ongoing feedback to major Project developers, identifying strengths and weaknesses.

d. Product Evaluation to relate outcomes to original objectives and determine effectiveness of activities.

2. Dissemination

Dissemination is defined as a skill-sharing and information-sharing process to communicate what the UMF/SAD #2 Teacher Corps Project has learned about inservice teacher training education in the training complex context to other LEA's in the state and educators regionally.

EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION - continued

a. Media Dissemination

(1) Monthly newsletters and press releases to state and regional publications

(2) Regular radio forums and TV panels through local commercial stations and the Maine Public Broadcasting Network.

b. Dissemination through training and visitation

Eight core groups of "consultant trainers" from other rural school districts in Maine will be trained in Greenville and skilled in such areas as group problem solving, needs assessment, resource identification, community organization, communication, etc. These "trainers" will then return to their own communities and install their own training complex.

III. REALITIES

A. Management

1. Staff Selection

The position of Project Director was an IHE (Institute of Higher Education) position and applications were screened by UMF staff. Two candidates were interviewed on April 25, 1977 by three PSC members who made recommendations to UMF. In May the Director (also the founder of the proposal) was selected. PSC members and the



Director then screened applicants for the rest of the positions, designed interview questions, conducted interviews and selected staff. UMF faculty were also involved in the selection of the IHE positions of PDS and Core Faculty. Responses to core staff positions were not overwhelming. A maximum of twelve applications were received for each of these positions. Two candidates for the position of PDS were selected for interviews. One, however, didn't show. Two candidates, including a SAD #2 faculty, were also interviewed for the position of core faculty. Four candidates were interviewed for the position of team leader and five for community coordinator. In contrast to a meager response to core positions, over 125 applications for intern positions were received. Twelve were interviewed and four selected. Core staff selected included two local persons, the editor of the Greenville newspaper as community coordinator and the assistant principal as team leader. One local person was also selected as an intern.

2. Committees

"The proposed management structure is intended to provide for maximum collaboration among all constituent role groups in the decision making process." (P.16 Project Proposal)

A series of committees, described below, were operationalized to serve as vehicles for Project collaboration and decision making.

In March, 1977, a memo from the Greenville principal requesting volunteers to serve on the Teacher Corps Advisory Committee was sent to teachers.

III. REALITIES - continued

2. Committees - continued

This committee was to "play a major role in the development of the Project" and to "be the advisory head of the Project." On April 12 the first meeting of the Project Steering Council (PSC), composed of representatives of all role groups as designated by the proposal, was held. Over the two years of the Project the council matured (with considerable struggling) into an active advisory board. At the start of the Project the council took a relatively active role in selecting Project staff and guiding the formation of PSC subcommittees, but as the year progressed its role was increasingly reactive and one of an approving body rather than a pro-active policy making body. At meetings actions were approved, some information was exchanged, comments were made and ideas tossed around, but often little else.

Points mentioned in one meeting were frequently not followed up in the next so that possible task or action plans were left dangling. Council members themselves expressed frustration throughout the year with the manner in which the council was operating. This frustration culminated in a confronting and outspoken meeting on February 28, 1978. Frustrations and concerns about the Project and the PSC were aired. As one community person stated, "If you want this committee to be functional, you can't just bring in a finished product to be rubber stamped."

One person suggested that a workshop be designed for PSC members to the end "that the PSC may acquire the skills and organizational structure that will enable it to function efficiently and effectively as the guiding and directing body."

Other requests included (1) the need for a clear policy statement on the function of the council, (2) the need for ongoing, updated information on what was happening, who was responsible and where the Project was going, and (3) the need for an established format or procedure to be followed in meetings. By the close of the meeting immediate tasks were identified and time lines established.

At the urging of PSC members a charter statement outlining the function of the council and guidelines to be followed was finally written in March. This represented a major change in the operation of the council. It started to exercise more power and organization. In May a format for running PSC meetings was adopted. The preservice, in-service and community education councils were to be formed and report monthly to the council on needs assessments and programs developed. Proposed activities were to be written in a proposal format and presented to the council members five days in advance. The agenda was also to be given to board members five days in advance. In addition financial statements were to be presented to the council monthly. These guidelines structuring the leadership of the meetings, information sharing and presentation of proposed activities continued to be followed throughout the second year of the Project and the council served as an important and real advising body.

The School Community Council was to oversee the

III. REALITIES - continued

2. Committees - continued

activities of the Teacher Corps, interact with community organizations and remain as the on-going coordinating group following the withdrawal of the Teacher Corps. Lengthy discussions between PSC members were held at the start of the Project. Concerns were raised about where the School-Community Council would stand in the hierarchy of the Teacher Corps, in addition to concerns about an overload of committees. It was suggested by one PSC member that the Community Education Committee could serve the same role of keeping in touch with the community. No further action was taken. As the termination of the Project grew closer, however, discussions about possibilities of continuing the PSC (the proposed role of the School-Community Council) resurfaced.

The emplacement of a School-Community Council was identified in the fall 1978 as a major goal of the Project. The Teacher Corps Director initiated a structured discussion regarding the possible continuation of a School-Community group at the January PSC meeting. The purpose of this was to assess and share members' views on possible continuation of the PSC and to bring attention to the need to start thinking about it. Planned follow-ups to this session, led by the Director and Principal, were held at subsequent PSC meetings, resulting in the writing of the School-Community Council Charter and the formation of a council.



A policy statement was approved by the school board on May 2, 1979 and the first meeting of the School-Community Council, melding the PSC and the Community Education Council, was held on May 21, 1979. The chairperson and vice chairperson are former PSC members and the secretary is the principal of Greenville schools. Monthly meetings have continued. The purpose of this group is to "actively work to facilitate the involvement of the community in improvement of the quality of and opportunities for education in our schools and to facilitate involvement of the schools in educationally related matters that will improve the quality of and opportunities for life in the community."

The Community Education Committee (CEC) was formed in the fall 1977, met regularly throughout the lifespan of the Project and functioned as planned, identifying community needs, recommending priorities and guiding the development of programs to meet these needs and priorities. About 25 persons were involved with the committee at one time or another, with about six to ten persons actively involved on an ongoing basis.

This committee guided the community component of the Project and also served as an active implementing body, particularly the second year of the Project. The committee started out as a pretty ragged group with lots of feelings and opinions expressed and shared, ideas tossed around, but little focusing or guided action toward meeting needs. By the second year, however, more of an organized problem solving mode of operation was apparent. Areas of concern were identified and subcommittees formed to work on specific needs.

III. REALITIES - continued

2. Committees - continued

The Preservice Committee, composed of two elementary teachers, one secondary teacher, the assistant principal, one community person, four interns, and the team leader, was designed to be responsible for need identification, planning and development of the intern program. The committee was not formed until June 1978, and then only at the urging of the PSC to serve a reporting function to the council. One meeting, led by the team leader, was held prior to the summer break, however, the committee appeared to serve no real function as the interns' programs were already defined, and was not heard of since.

Two Inservice Committees (on approval and implementation) were formed as a part of the INSERV process in the fall of 1977. These committees were designed to serve as means of assessing teacher needs, and designing and implementing strategies to meet these needs. Through INSERV a teacher could submit a proposal for inservice activities to the approval committee, composed of school and community people, which was - if approved - then sent to the implementation committee, which determined the parameters for actual implementation of the proposal. Three INSERV meetings were held throughout the fall but the INSERV process proved to be too cumbersome and too slow to be useful and the committees soon became dysfunctional.

A committee on Inservice Teacher Education, composed of one elementary teacher, one secondary teacher, one community, one board member, the core faculty and PDS, and headed by the Teacher Corps PDS, was formed in June 1978 at the insistence of the PSC, to serve a reporting function to the council. Two meetings were held, but as with the Preservice Committee, it appeared to serve no real function and was formally disbanded in October.

3. Leadership/Accountability

Project management appeared to be somewhat chaotic the first year of the Project. Project goals and objectives were not clearly identified, planning was not readily apparent, roles and responsibilities of staff were unclear, followup assistance to staff and Project committees was limited or non-existent and decision making channels were not defined.

The management style of the first Director of the Project was described as one of "spoking," with the Director at the hub of the Project, represented as separate spokes. The Director was thus responsible for overseeing the Project and interacting with all involved persons, which he did. The Director kept a tight rein on the flow of information between and among Project participants and coupled with (or perhaps due to problems in collaboration and communications, interaction and communication between and among members of different role groups was limited. The Director controlled the flow of information. As one staff person noted the first year, "the wheel is rimless." The management and decision making style was thus largely one to one.

III. REALITIES - continued

3. Leadership/Accountability - continued

The Director's (Year #1) leadership style differed with each staff person, from delegating responsibilities with the community coordinator and team leader, who operated relatively autonomously, to "selling" or "telling" with the PDS and core faculty, who responded to more direction. Responsibilities were reassigned, readjusted or withdrawn as skills did or did not emerge.

According to all staff, the Director's style was characteristically "high relationship" and "low task." He attempted to provide - and was concerned about - human support for each staff person, but was not performance oriented. This style was described by one staff person as "benign neglect." Once tasks were assigned little, if any, followup or monitoring occurred and no system of accountability or evaluation was established for any staff person, (including the Director.)

The second year of the Project was marked by some major changes. The Director (Year #1) resigned in September, followed by a succession of acting directors for two months and the appointment and approval of the team leader as Project Director (II) on November 21, 1978. Project leadership throughout the fall as well as the remainder of the year was consistently action oriented. The expectation was clear, in order for the Project to survive, loose ends had to be tied together and information about the Project openly communicated. The status of existing activities had to be reviewed and acknowledged, decisions had to be made regarding activities in planning stages, the budget had to be openly accounted for. Such expectations were initially by the Dean, who assumed a firm directive role and was primarily responsible for identification of the Directors. The UMF Coordinator of Graduate Studies, in his brief role as Acting Director and the Director, continued this style. Primary responsibility for an action oriented leadership style, however, rested with the Team Leader/Director (II), acting as laison between Greenville and then Project Director (II). Throughout the remaining year of the Project he actively sought to; maintain open communication channels through frequent interaction and open information sharing with all participating persons; define and clarify staff roles and responsibilities; assist staff in designing action plans (including time lines;) monitor followup of stated responsibilities - prodding and reminding as necessary. His leadership style was "high task" and "high relationship," being action oriented but also providing support and assistance to staff. He also attempted to establish an accountability system with the Project staff, largely through clear definition of responsibilities and expectations.

The reward system, however, was largely intrinsic to the satisfaction of doing what you were responsible for and doing it well. Few tangible incentives - such as job security or salary - existed at this stage of the Project.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

Attempts were made by the Director (I) at the start of the Project to define the roles and responsibilities of the staff in accordance with skills and knowledge and interests, rather than in accordance with job titles.

III. REALITIES - continued

4. Roles and Responsibilities - continued

Considerable time was spent by staff filling in and discussing roles and responsibilities charts. These forms, however, were cumbersome and confusing to most staff and were eventually discarded. To start, the staff had a great deal of autonomy in their roles. Over time, responsibilities were readjusted and reassigned and skills did or did not emerge.

Roles were shaped largely by the Director (I), whose leadership style varied from one staff person to another, from "delegating" responsibilities with some, to "selling" or "telling" with others, depending on his perception of their level of competence and operational style. In addition, some responsibilities were simply taken by staff members if of particular interest to them. Others, in turn, were rejected. Roles were thus fluid rather than static and were not rigidly defined. Roles were adjusted to fit the staff rather than the staff adjusted to fit the role. The staff's roles became what they did. The ambiguity of the roles caused considerable frustration for staff as well as Project participants. Throughout the first year cries for clear role definition were heard repeatedly from school, community and UMF staff.

The second year of the Project, under different leadership, roles and responsibilities were clearly defined and documented, although not always followed through. A series of concentrated high task work sessions were held throughout November and December to identify Project objectives and responsibilities of each staff person.



The Director (II) attempted with questionable success to define job responsibilities somewhat in line with job title, in order to avoid confusion and fragmentation about who was doing what. Although the definition of job titles remained somewhat ambiguous, particularly for the PDS and core faculty (now called field based instructor,) job responsibilities were clearly identified and documented by the staff. Major responsibilities of the Project staff over the lifespan of the Project are reviewed below.

The Team Leader was responsible for the intern program. He was the interns' advocate and created and provided an ongoing support system for the interns as well as designing activities, coordinating, supervising and instructing. The Team Leader was also responsible for coordinating the inservice exceptionality component of the Project. Following the resignation of the Director in September 1978, he continued these responsibilities along with serving as liaison between UMF and Greenville and unofficial leader and organizer of the staff. In November, he was appointed Director (II) of the Project and was responsible for overseeing the second year of the Project, identifying goals, assisting staff with planning, including prodding for followup of responsibilities, and shaping activities when necessary. The Director (II) was also co-designer and coordinator of the Human Services Fair in November 1978, designed and coordinated the Rural Education Conference in April 1979, instructed a graduate course "Psychology of the Adult Learner" in the winter 1979, wrote one grant, and guided the development of a School-Community Council.

III. REALITIES - continued

4. Roles and Responsibilities - continued

The parameters of responsibilities of the Community Coordinator, as with the Team Leader, were more clearly defined throughout the Project than those of the PDS and the Core Faculty. This was in part due to the nature of these roles, each being attached to a more concrete piece of the Project, and in part to the self-initiating operational style of these two persons and their interaction with the Director (I). Whereas the Team Leader was clearly responsible for the intern program, the Community Coordinator was clearly responsible for the community component of the Project. The first year of the Project responsibilities included the formation and ongoing leadership of the Community Education Council; the design, coordination and implementation of the community needs assessment; writing three Teacher Corps Newsletters; coordinating the delivery of ten workshops and two undergraduate courses; and initiating a literacy program. The second year focused sub-committees of the CEC were formed and the Community Coordinator was responsible for ongoing coordination and leadership of these groups. Additional responsibilities included compiling a resource catalog, co-writing a guide for parent teacher conferences, writing two newsletters, continuing the development of a literacy program, coordinating the delivery of two undergraduate courses and several workshops; coordinating the delivery of a series of seminars on multicultural education and securing a policy statement/endorsing of community education by the school board.

The role of the Program Development Specialist (PDS) was multifaceted and somewhat fragmented throughout the Project. Although he was initially charged with the responsibility of developing the masters program, the Director (I) reassigned this responsibility, essentially taking it on himself, and the PDS, in practice, did little program developing outside of the individualization program at the start of the Project. The Director (I) in fact served as the program developer. The PDS assumed the following responsibilities the first year of the Project:

- designing and coordinating the individualization program
- teaching two courses to the interns
- co-designing the community needs assessment with the Community Coordinator
- evaluating courses and workshops
- teaching a workshop on individualization
- teaching a media workshop
- assisting in planning and delivery of the summer curriculum institute
- presenting an overview of curriculum development at the summer institute
- designing a needs assessment used in spring
- assisted in planning of the Media Center

The second year his involvement lessened and consisted of the following isolated activities:

- teaching a research course to teachers
- writing two Teacher Corps Updates
- writing an analysis of the community needs assessment
- coordinating delivery of the masters courses
- working with one teacher on computer curriculum

III. REALITIES - continued

4. Roles and Responsibilities - continued

- coordinating the Tri-county Workshop
- documenting the Rural Education Conference
- designing and evaluating a section of the M.Ed. comprehensive exams.

Throughout the Project the PDS served a strong instructional role and one of technical assistance.

The role of the Core Faculty (or Field-based Instructor), as the PDS, was less clearly defined than that of the team leader and community coordinator. The first year of the Project the Core Faculty was responsible for designing and coordinating the INSERV process, an early attempt at needs assessment and staff development which lasted throughout the fall. She was also responsible for coordinating the delivery of two onsite courses providing followup assistance to participants, assisting in planning of the summer institute, coordinating the services of several UMF faculty, and providing assistance to several Greenville teachers.

The second year of the Project her responsibilities included supervising two student teachers; evaluating two summer school courses; assisting in the development, field testing and publication of minicourses; participating in curriculum chairperson and language arts meetings and assisting as appropriate; teaching a minicourse; assisting in dissemination of information from conference on children's literature; providing assistance to teachers; coordinating initiation of a local staff development committee; and assisting in the design and coordination of the comprehensive exam. Throughout the Project, particularly the second year, the primary role of the field-based instructor evolved into one of creating an ongoing, consistent support system for SAD #2 teachers. Such behind the scene assistance was recognized by over half the school staff by the close of the Project.

In January, a SAD #2 elementary teacher joined the Teacher Corps Project as a full time staff person, filling the then vacated position of Team Leader. This position was much in question at the time of the Team Leader's move to Directorship. Some persons felt it was not necessary and did not want to bother with it, others felt that it was essential to identify a person to assume the responsibilities of the Team Leader, in addition to other Project activities. Ultimately, Washington decreed the necessity of filling the position. A series of discussions were then held at staff and PSC meetings regarding the nature of such a role and a selection process was negotiated between school administrators and Project staff. The Project staff, with the Director serving as chief negotiator, were strongly in favor of opening the position to SAD #2 faculty only, with equal access for all teachers (as opposed to an administrative appointment.) After some discussion the SAD #2 administrative team agreed to support a teacher taking a leave of absence to fill the position of Team Leader for half a year. The responsibilities of this role were jointly identified by school administrators and Project staff.

Five teachers applied for the position and were interviewed by two SAD #2 administrators, two board members, the Project Director and one intern. A fourteen year elementary teaching veteran was selected as Team Leader. Her primary responsibilities

III. REALITIES - continued

4. Roles and Responsibilities - continued

were two-fold: (1) to serve as a resource for interns in a variety of capacities, and (2) to work directly with school personnel in their curriculum effort. (This person served as a natural and strong linkage of the Teacher Corps with the school system.)

The bulk of her work was with the curriculum development effort, as resource person, documentor and organizer. Her responsibilities included meeting weekly with the assistant principal to plan and review, attending all curriculum meetings, recording progress and assisting committees in their work. Assistance included gathering materials for social studies and science committees, setting up visitation sites for gifted committee, coordinating plans for social studies committee members to attend the Northeast Regional Conference for the Social Studies, and identifying resource materials. She also investigated ideas for a resource file, compiled information, purchased necessary equipment and organized a filing system. In addition to work with curriculum development, the team leader acted in an advisory capacity to the interns, since their programs were already clearly outlined and in progress. As advisor she observed several times, coordinated field experiences, took care of M.Ed. requirements and documented field experiences.

5. Decision Making

Channels of decision making were not clear the first year of the Project. No one seemed to know who was accountable for what and who had the "power" to make or act on decisions. It was, therefore, difficult to trace back an activity to a decision to a rationale to a person or group. Conflicting reports were heard repeatedly. The Director (I), however, was frequently cited as the focal point. Most decisions appeared to have been by the Director, in conjunction with others. The University was also frequently cited as the ultimate decision maker, usually meaning the Dean of Education at UMF or some shadowy figure at USM. Degree requirements appeared to be tightly controlled by USM.

Attempts were made in the second year of the Project by the Director (II) to clearly define decision making patterns. The Project staff emerged as a primary planning and decision making body. Plans for activities were drawn up by individual staff members and presented to the staff for approval or modification. Most decisions regarding design of inservice activities, roles, and expenditure of money were made by the staff by majority vote. All decisions regarding travel were made by the staff. This process of decision making, as well the role of the Director (one vote), was determined by staff.

The Project Steering Council also served an important decision making role the second year of the Project. All Teacher Corps plans for activities involving sustained involvement of personnel and/or money had to be presented to the PSC in the form of a proposal for approval. Twenty-two proposals were presented since October. Although the PSC did not serve a major planning function, this process provided a real opportunity for input and modification from PSC members, as well as serving as a means of updating and information. All proposals involving the IHE budget had to first be approved by the Dean of Education, before being presented to the PSC. As with the PSC, this process provided an opportunity for input and modification of Project activities by the Dean.

III. REALITIES - continued

5. Decision Making - continued

The Community Council continued in its role as the active guiding, planning and in some cases implementing body of the community component of the Project. Many decisions were made by the community coordinator, in conjunction with the Council

6. Goals/Planning

Project goals and objectives were never really clearly identified the first year of the Project and although documentation indicates that some isolated activities/programs were clearly well planned - such as the exceptionality program and the curriculum institute - sustained, systematic Project planning encompassing both short and long range goals for all Project components, was not apparent. Instead planning appeared to be reactionary and short term. Desired end products and outcomes were identified by various staff at various times, but few plans of action to reach these outcomes were evident. Plans may have existed (in one's head or personal notes,) but they were not visible nor communicated to others, resulting in the appearance - as one school person stated - of a "haphazard or hit or miss approach to school design."

The second year of the Project attempts were made by the Director (II) to plan for the entire year, incorporating short and long range goals, emerging and fixed activities. Specific goals, plans of action and time lines were identified and documented, presenting an overview of the entire Project. Planning in advance, identifying specific actions and deadlines for projected activities was not easy nor considered desirable by Project staff and the resulting specificity of plans varied widely from staff person to person. The degree of planning behind each activity/program rested on the skills and concerns of the person responsible.

7. Collaboration

Collaboration was a key ideal underlying the Project and the success of the Project ultimately lay in the degree of collaboration between and among all constituent role groups.

In practice, some collaboration between involved persons of different role groups occurred, but it was a real struggle and occurred only over time. Some key participants were simply not able to work together and linkages necessary for collaboration were not made. The first year of the Project was described by participants as a win/lose, we/they arena and was pervaded with an atmosphere of distrust. All key participants had different perspectives and each had their own piece, their own pet interest or concern, whether it was the realities of the classroom, the graduate program, the community voice, academic quality, research, field-based programs, etc. People had great difficulty in considering others' perspectives and realities, listening to these perspectives, and possible modifying their version of what should be - in short, compromising. Effective collaboration assumes interpersonal skills and skills of communication and problem solving. Few persons exhibited these the first year of the Project.

III. REALITIES - continued

7. Collaboration - continued

In addition to skills, collaboration requires opportunities for sharing information, exchanging views and planning, both formal and informal. The first year channels of information exchange appeared to be more informal and irregular than not. Regular communication between key decision makers was limited. Personal and professional differences also created barriers to communication which many prime players did not attempt to remove. Sustained efforts to communicate and work together were not made.

Some groups met regularly the first year, with varying degrees of success as collaborative bodies. Over time, the PSC gained skills and identity and served as a collaborative advising and leading body. The CEC also served as a forum for exchange of views and active involvement in Project activities. Project staff meetings were held weekly but due to interpersonal and philosophical conflicts, little collaboration occurred the first year. The staff, composed of a diverse group of persons of differing educational, political and religious backgrounds, had enormous problems working together as a team. Little sense of staff unity or support was apparent and was noticeable to school and community people as well as IHE faculty.

The summer curriculum institute was cited by many persons interviewed in September 1978 as the only example of collaboration the first year of the Project. The Teacher Corps staff and SAD #2 administration worked closely together over a period of about three months, to identify needs and plan this program, linking it as necessary with the University criteria to obtain graduate credit. It was a frustrating process but the result was a compromise that was mutually agreable to both sides and of benefit to the teachers.

Another notable example of collaboration the first year of the Project was the exceptionality program, initiated in the fall of 1977 and continuing throughout the duration of the Project. This program was the result of a joint effort between the Teacher Corps Team Leader, the UMF Coordinator, the SAD #2 Assistant Principal and the SAD #2 Director of Special Education. Needs were identified, strategies to meet needs developed and revised. Information was clearly documented, exchanged between parties for further discussion and revision, decisions were made, and services delivered as appropriate.

Collaborative efforts continued and expanded the second year of the Project. The PSC and CEC continued to serve as collaborative bodies and a formerly splintered Project staff began to work together as a team. The resignation of the Director (I) forced the staff to work together, united by the common goal of Project survival. The Director (II) was visible, a known figure, considered accessible, and was in frequent contact with SAD #2 administrators as well as UMF faculty. The Community Coordinator worked with the Dean of Public Services writing a grant and delivering workshops, and also with the Dean of Education planning a series of multicultural seminars. The town manager was also involved with

III. REALITIES - continued

7. Collaboration - continued

the Community Coordinator and the CEC, when writing a grant on drug and alcohol abuse. The second year of the Project the Community Coordinator spent more time in the schools and was in relatively frequent contact with the principal discussing school-community involvement, ultimately resulting in a policy statement approved by the school board.

The Field-based Instructor worked with a UMF faculty person and an outside consultant developing, field testing and publishing minicourses. She also made efforts to work with the assistant principal regarding curriculum development althouth with minimal success due to differences in professional styles, and the outcome was a relatively passive role for the Teacher Corps. The Teacher Corps staff decided, in response to SAD #2's ownership of the curriculum process, that the appropriate Teacher Corps role was restricted to provision of money to support committee activities. The Team Leader (II) worked closely with administration and with teachers on the curriculum committees.

The most notable collaborative effort the second year of the Project was the formation of a school-community council. This council was the result of two years of working together, building trust between school, community and IHE persons.



8. Communication

According to all persons interviewed, communication patterns the first year of the Project were unclear and inconsistent, although they improved throughout the year. It was not clear to Project participants what was happening, who was responsible and how all the pieces were integrated into a whole, if indeed they were. The uncertainity of role definition added to the "infamous communication problem." (So labeled by a UMF professor.) People were not sure who to turn to for information regarding certain activities, resulting in the grapevine becoming a major source of information. Patterns of contact tended to be informal and irregular. Although staff and PSC meetings were held regularly, it took time for participants and leaders to learn to share useful information, to ask appropriate questions and to structure these meetings so they were purposeful. These two groups thus served a limited role the first year as vehicles for communication. Meetings between key participants in varying role groups were infrequent and irregular. Primary decision makers from all role groups met only once since the conception of the Project, and that was only due to the resignation of the Director. At the start of the Project plans were made to link a SAD #2 administrator with Project staff meetings and vica versa. This was not followed through, however, by either group.

Most Project staff were not visible in schools the first year. No clear, consistent linkages between UMF and Greenville was established. The director (I) and PDS were frequently, (although this tapered off as the Project progressed) but irregularly on

III. REALITIES - continued

8. Communication - continued

campus and according to UMF faculty, contact with Project staff was irregular and infrequent. Each UMF staff person seemed to have a different staff person to whom they turned. As one UMF professor commented, "We really are 90 miles apart." No collective meetings of UMF and Project staff and/or teachers or community persons were held. Written pieces to inform people included biweekly updates from the Director, disseminated from October 25 to February 8; monthly Project calendars; two newsletters; and updates on intern happenings. Many people, however, didn't read these. Although they wanted to be informed, additional things to read were not welcome to many.

The second year of the Project communication channels appeared to be more clearly defined and more open than previously, although not necessarily more frequent. The primary vehicle for opening communication (and collaboration) was regular and frequent meetings, both formal and informal, of persons involved in the Project to get together to assess the present status of affairs and discuss what directions the Project might take. A meeting of all major participants and decision makers, (the only meeting since the start of the Project) including UMF and SAD #2 administrators and Project staff, was held in September. Four meetings of the Project staff and the Dean took place throughout the fall, three at UMF and one in Greenville, in addition to several meetings of the staff and the UMF Coordinator of Graduate Studies (then Acting Director.) Project staff meetings were held regularly each week. These meetings were vital in opening communication. Efforts to open communication through regular contact with UMF and SAD #2 personnel continued. The Director was in communication with the Dean and other involved UMF faculty several times a month. The Field-based Instructor was also on campus several times a month. The Community Coordinator was in contact with UMF staff as appropriate. The Director also met informally with school administrators a couple of times each week and was accessible when needed. Although these meetings were issue oriented and were not regularly scheduled, contact appeared to be regular and relatively frequent. The principal of the high school also attended several staff and CEC meetings, as his schedule allowed, and the Director attended bi-weekly meetings of SAD #2 administrators and the Greenville Teachers Association president.

The Field-based Instructor was also more visible in the schools and accessible, and the contact between the Community Coordinator and the Principal increased as well throughout the fall.

Project staff meetings were also consistently held weekly throughout the fall and winter and became the major forum for exchange of information and decision making. These meetings, led by the Director, were clearly organized, with agendas prepared in advance and more or less followed. The meetings provided a structure for exchange of and updating information among staff, regarding all Project activities as well as a structure for follow through of designated tasks (tasks which are to be reported to a group are more likely to be followed up.)

III. REALITIES - continued

8. Communication - continued

The weekly staff meetings also became a major arena for open confrontation and decision making. Lively exchanges took place and disagreements were openly aired. Through this open give and take, reasonable compromises were made. The staff appeared to learn to listen to one another, be open to each other's perspectives and to make decisions based on information given, with the Project's best interests in mind. Communication among staff was "open and out front," at least more than previously.

The Project Steering Council meetings, held monthly, were also used as a vehicle for keeping people informed. As with staff meetings, they were well organized and managed and served as a time for open review of Project activities. The status of the Project budget was also clearly presented at these meetings by the Project Director and Community Coordinator. Project monies were openly accounted for.

In addition to meetings, written pieces were used to inform persons of the status of Project activities. Memos regarding scheduling, visitations, etc., were sent regularly to involved persons and minutes of all Project staff and PSC meetings sent to key personnel. Two updates clearly reviewing the status of Project activities were written by the PDS and were disseminated to community and school people.

A majority of school, community and IHE persons interviewed at the close of the Project felt that communication had indeed improved from the first year of the Project. Many contributed to the improvement of the behavior of the new Director (II) who was "accessible," "a teacher advocate," "organized," "in tune with people," and who "made positive attempts to be clear." As one person noted: "Now I feel I can get answers." Time and increased contact with some staff were also cited as major contributing factors. Over time, people simply became more aware of what was happening. As one teacher commented, "maybe because people were more interested they finally asked!"

9. Evaluation

An outside consultant was hired at the start of the Project for twenty days to implement a basic discrepancy evaluation system designed by another outside consultant. However, it was impossible to gather baseline data needed and this role evolved into "gathering data from a variety of sources to determine what was happening, and to provide continuous feedback to be used as a basis for Project decision making and possible modification." Sources of data included documentation, onsite visits and observations, and personal interviews with Project participants. Project staff were interviewed in October, UMF staff in December, and randomly selected school and community persons in January.

The interviews were repeated the following September. Throughout the year observations and suggestions were made to the Director and certain staff persons regarding their performance, and three feedback reports were written and disseminated following each series of interviews. A comprehensive report of the first year of the Project, including accomplishments, problems and recommendations was written in September.

III. REALITIES - continued

9. Evaluation - continued

Throughout the first year the PDS was responsible for evaluating many of the workshops and courses delivered in Greenville. Evaluation included design of questionnaires, and collection, analysis and summary of data. The core faculty was also responsible for evaluating two summer courses, which she did the following fall.

The role of the evaluator/documentor expanded the second year of the Project to a half-time position. The evaluation system was designed "as a useful management tool to affect ongoing decision making as well as to provide an analysis of the discrepancy, if any, between expectations and actual outcomes." Responsibilities included 1) provision of assistance to Project staff in the formulation of goals and plans, 2) monitoring Project progress in relation to identified objectives and providing feedback to staff, 3) collection of data using a variety of instruments, 4) production and delivery of a final, summative evaluation report, and 5) defining and operationalizing a documentation system. Concentrated work sessions were held weekly throughout November and December to identify Project goals, roles, and plans. The evaluator served as facilitator and documentor.

It was a slow process. At this time, the staff agreed to write three status reports, in January, April and June, describing Project progress in relation to goals, effectiveness of outcomes and adaptations. These were then to be used as a major source of data for the progress reports which were to be written by the evaluator/documentor. Although the staff agreed to write the reports (staff decision,) it was a struggle for some and a nuisance when it actually came time to do them. The results were incomplete and the evaluator requested re-writes from most staff. Revisions were written by early February, but additional interviews with staff were necessary to collect data needed for the progress report which was completed February 20. SAD #2 administrators were also interviewed at this time. Due to an unrealistic time line, second reports were dropped. All staff but the PDS wrote status reports in June and the final progress report was incorporated into the summative report written at the close of the Project.

The PDS, an experienced evaluator, and the evaluator/documentor met in early January 1979, to review activities and determine appropriate evaluation tools. Evaluation of many of the Project objectives was simply whether or not the objective/activity was met. In addition, all courses, workshops and consultants were to be evaluated through participant report.

The PDS agreed to assume responsibility for designing questionnaires or interviews to evaluate on-site courses, workshops and consultants. The evaluator was to administer (if interviews) and analyze data. Forms were designed and sent in June to participants of five of seven inservice courses which had been taught during the year, including one course which had been taught the previous fall. The lag time was due to reticence on the part of the PDS, who felt that at this time the evaluations would serve no purpose as the Project was closing.

III. REALITIES - 9. Evaluation - continued

Data was collected, however, through the directive of the Director (II.) Consultants were not evaluated. Evaluations of the two courses and several workshops offered through the community component were gathered by the Community Coordinator. An overview of the documentation system implemented the second year of the Project is presented below. Included are objectives, persons responsible, time lines (as identified in November 1978 and actual outcomes. See chart below.

| Objectives | Persons Responsible | Time Lines | Actual Outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|
| A system documenting Project goals and progress will be defined, put into operation and information will be disseminated to appropriate persons. | Director/ Evaluator | Ongoing | Forms of documentation were presented by the evaluator to staff in November and reviewed and updated January 9. Identified documents were disseminated by the Project staff. |
| 1. Project goals/desired outcomes person(s) responsible, plans of action and time lines will be identified and documented. | Staff/ Evaluator | November | Goals, roles, and time lines were identified by staff in November and December and documented by the evaluator/documentor. |
| 2. Status reports describing Project progress in relation to goals, effectiveness of outcomes and adaptations will be written. | Staff | Jan.15<br>April 2<br>June | Although the staff agreed in November to write status reports, it was a struggle and a nuisance when it actually came time to do them, and the evaluator requested rewrites from most staff persons. The staff raised questions regarding the purpose and nature of the reports, which needed further clarification, along with the usefulness and appropriateness of such a means of data collection. After some discussion the staff agreed to rewrite the reports as necessary and use a combination of interviews for the second report. Reports were written by January 15 and all revisions done by February 6. Due to an unrealistic time line, the second reports were dropped. All staff, but the PDS, wrote status reports in June. |

III. REALITIES - 9. Evaluation - continued

| Objectives | Persons Responsible | Time Lines | Actual Outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Project progress will be monitored in relation to identified objectives and feedback to staff provided.<br>3.1 Three progress reports will be written and disseminated. | Evaluator/ Documentor | Ongoing<br>Jan.22<br>April 9<br>June | Informal feedback was provided continuously. Staff status reports (the basis for the progress reports) were written January 15, but revisions were not completed until February 6. Interviews to gather additional data were held February 12 and the progress report was completed February 20. Due to unrealistic time lines the second report was dropped and the final report was incorporated into the summative report, written in July/August. |
| 4. Teacher Corps updates will be written regularly and disseminated to appropriate persons | PDS | bimonthly | Two Teacher Corps Updates were written in October and December and disseminated to SAD #2, UMF staff. |
| 5. Teacher Corps Newsletter will be written and distributed. | Community Coordinator | Dec./March/ June | The newsletter was delayed from November 1 to November 22 to December 1 to mid-January, due to lack of time, editorial problems and lack of a typist. It finally went to press January 31. The newsletter was geared for a local audience and focused on school news. |
| 6. Evaluation of services will be documented | Staff | Ongoing | Participant evaluations from five of seven in-service courses, two community courses and two community workshops were received. |
| 7. Minutes of all meetings including purposes and outcomes and next steps will be written by staff. | Staff | Ongoing | Minutes of the PSC and staff meetings were written regularly. Minutes of Community Council meetings were sporadic. |
| 8. A summative report of the Project will be written | Evaluator/ Documentor | June 15 | The report kept growing. Data was collected through June and report written in July/August. |

## B. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

### 1. Inservice Component

A variety of tools assessing teacher needs were designed and used throughout the first year of the Project. These are described below.

- In April 1977, at the first meeting of the PSC a list of district needs were presented by the assistant principal and the director of special education. All of these were incorporated in the stated thrusts of the Project and many related to the need for greater school-community linkages.

- In September, the Teacher Corps staff participated in teachers' staff meetings and generated a list of teacher suggestions about what the Teacher Corps could do for them. No plans to attempt to meet these stated needs were designed.

- The INSERV process, piloted in the fall, was designed as a primary, ongoing means of assessing individual teacher needs and providing resources and materials to meet these needs. Six proposals were written by SAD #2 faculty and submitted but the committees soon became dysfunctional as the process of writing a proposal and sending it through two committees proved to be too slow and cumbersome. People could not be responded to quickly enough. In addition, teachers felt no ownership in the process. INSERV belonged to the Project, not to them.

- A preworkshop survey, designed by several teachers and the Teacher Corps core faculty, determined the preferences of the school staff regarding selected possibilities for a workshop on October 3.

- Evaluations of workshops held on October 3, indicated a strong interest in continuation of work on individualization, which led to the design of the November 14 and December 2/3 workshops.

- In October the Team Leader, UMF Coordinator of exceptional child services met with the SAD #2 principal and special education director to identify specific inservice needs. Five areas of need were identified and programs designed and implemented over the two years of the Project. Consultants in turn, assessed needs of individual teachers and children.

- Throughout the fall, SAD #2 went through a systematic self-evaluation process which served as a distric needs assessment tool. The self-evaluation report, written November 17, identified specific system needs. The Teacher Corps attempted to link their "individualization program" with these efforts and provided consultant assistance throughout the process.

- In December, several questionnaires were sent to teachers to assess teacher interest in a summer institute and also to assess the degree of interest in particular courses, preferred formats and times of presentation.

- In January, five UMF consultants met with teachers and identified very specific needs which they perceived as well as needs teachers perceived. These consultants worked with teachers for several months

B. NEEDS ASSESSMENT - Inservice Component
continued

- A summer activity questionnaire was sent to teachers by SAD #2 administrators on March 17 to assess interest in summer courses and time preferences.

- The Team Leader attended a teachers' meeting in March at which teachers' concerns about the Teacher Corps and the individualization program were voiced.

- In the spring a needs assessment tool was designed by the PDS and all teachers were personally interviewed by Project staff. This tool was designed to provide evaluative feedback on existing services the Teacher Corps had delivered as well as to assess needs for Year #2. However, no analysis of information collected was made and data collected appeared to simply add support to the Year #2 proposal which had already been written.

- In June specific motor needs were identified by a UMF consultant who had been working with district teachers and students.

- Evaluations from workshops and courses served somewhat as assessment tools and were used to define expectations of field-based courses the second year.

The second year of the Project, the primary vehicles for identifying district and teacher needs were curriculum committees, composed of teachers and administrators. These committees served as a part of a systematic, long range plan - designed and managed by the assistant principal - for district curriculum development and coordination. The system was developed as a continuation and offshoot of the self-evaluation process. The Teacher Corps assisted this process through the provision of monies for services and materials to meet needs identified by the committees. The Teacher Corps initially attempted to play a more active role in this process but were rebuked by the assistant principal, due to personal and professional conflicts, and instead the Teacher Corps agreed to provide services only upon request. It was made very clear that the ownership of the process rested with SAD #2.

Additional needs assessment tools included several questionnaires assessing SAD #2 interest in counseling, administrative courses and minicourses.

2. Community Component

- A comprehensive community needs assessment was designed in the fall, 1978, by the Community Coordinator and interns, with special assistance from the Program Development Specialist, and conducted throughout the winter and spring. Community volunteers were trained to conduct the survey which thus served as a means of involving community persons, as well as reaching out to the community and assessing needs. This process was viewed as being of equal importance as the data collected. It was also time consuming and took longer than anticipated to complete. The survey was not finished until the spring of 1979. Data collected was thus not directly

B. NEEDS ASSESSMENT - Community Component (continued)

used in the determination of programs/services delivered; although several town people later used information collected.

- The Community Education Committee, composed primarily of community persons, served as a primary informal assessing group throughout the Project. Members were encouraged to involve friends and neighbors and information gathered from others was used in the determination of services.

- A literacy assessment was made in the fall, 1977 through informal interviews with key community persons. This was followed up by identification and training of volunteers in summer of 1978.

- Evaluations of workshops and courses and the number of persons attending also served as indicators of community interests.

- An informal survey on Drug and Alcohol Abuse was made in the fall, 1978, and followed up by a proposal on Drug and Alcohol Abuse.

- Methods of assessing community needs were informal and more intuitive than not. No systematic, planned sequence of assessment was apparent.

3. Pre-Service Component

Ongoing informal assessments of individual intern needs, interests, talents and expectations were made throughout the first year. The team leader was in close contact with the interns and regular team meetings were held to provide a forum for discussion and feedback. Although the degree requirements were clearly and traditionally defined by the University of Maine, with few choices allowed, the interns managed, through sustained voicing of needs, wants and expectations, to influence the shaping of their programs in accordance with their interests and needs, largely through field experiences which were the direct result of their interests. One intern managed to negotiate a major in adult education rather than exceptionality.

4. University of Maine at Farmington - Needs/ Expectations

Basic Master of Education program expectations regarding requirements, with a concentration in exceptionality, were stated as early as spring, 1977, although confusion existed throughout the first six months of the Project regarding possible options for concentration. As late as January, 1978, alternatives to an exceptionality concentration for interns were discussed.

Interests of UMF faculty appeared to be assessed informally. No collective meetings of interested faculty with Project staff and/or Greenville people were held and no questionnaires were disseminated to assess interests/needs.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES

1. INSERVICE COMPONENT

Services provided by the Teacher Corps Project for SAD #2 personnel are described below

| Year I: Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oct. 3, 1977 | Workshop-Choice of: "Individualized Instruction" "Affective Games" "Educational Games" "Exceptional Child in Classroom" (P.L.94-142) | 4 UMF faculty 1 T.C. Staff (P.D.S.) | SAD #2 personnel (required in-service day) | Offered in response to need to be visible. A pre-workshop survey identifying possible topics, designed by a small group of teachers and the Core Faculty (T.C.) was administered prior to the Workshop. Over 70% of participants attended the Individualization session. |

a. Individualization Program

The individualization program was the initial Teacher Corps effort to deliver services to Greenville teachers, designed in response to district interest in individualized instruction to link SAD #2 teachers with UMF content specialists. Linkage of the program with the district's self-evaluation process was also designed through UMF faculty involvement with self-evaluation (curriculum committess.) Six recertification credits were to be received for participation.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nov.14 1977 | Workshop ½ day "Individualizing Instruction" | 1 T.C. staff (P.D.S.) | SAD #2 personnel (required in-service day) | Offered as first in series of services in individualizing instruction program. Designed as a diagnostic work session to begin strategies for planning and implementing individualized programs. |
| Dec.2/3 1977 | Workshops on individualizing instruction in math, science, language arts, physical ed., media | 5 UMF faculty 1 T.C. staff (P.D.S.) | SAD #2 personnel 9 elem.teachers 3 secondary 4 K-12 Specials | Designed to (1) introduce teachers to current materials available for individualizing instruction in content areas, and (2) plan for involvement of UMF faculty in working with teachers on individualizing instruction. Specific follow-up was indentified for all participants. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jan.10, 1978 | Assistance in self-evaluation process<br>-Curriculum Committee meetings | 4 UMF faculty | SAD #2 personnel | Designed to link SAD #2 self-evaluation curriculum effort with individualization program. Consultants assisted in curriculum meetings, serving to identify and prioritize curriculum needs, and also worked individually with SAD #2 faculty. These sessions also provided the opportunity for consultants to assess needs they perceived as well those the teachers perceived. |
| Jan.11, 1978 | -individual consultation | 5 UMF faculty | SAD #2 personnel<br>8 elementary<br>8 secondary<br>3 specialists | |
| Jan.12, 1978 | -consultation | 1 UMF faculty | 3 specialists | |
| Feb.27, 1978 | -Curriculum Committee meetings | 3 UMF faculty | SAD #2 personnel | |
| Ongoing through winter | Individual Consultation | 6 UMF faculty | SAD #2 personnel<br>12 secondary<br>9 elementary<br>3 specialists | Provided follow up to self-evaluation/individualization efforts. Was to offer 6 credits, but never materialized due to lack of follow up by Teacher Corps. |

b. Exceptionality Program - The exceptionality program was developed in response to stated Project thrusts within the context of stated Greenville needs. Specific services were designed and delivered through joint effort of Teacher Corps Team Leader, the UMF Coordinator, the Assistant Principal and the Special Education Director. Four areas of need were identified and appropriate consultants brought in, who in turn, assessed needs of individual teachers. No credit was received for this involvement.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Motor Development<br><br>Oct.-June 1977-1978 | Consultant 15 days on site in Greenville | 1 UMF faculty | SAD #2<br>2 physical ed. & 2 special ed. staff<br>3 teachers<br>2 administrators | Motor Development inserving was assessed as a need by the assistant principal, special education director and Teacher Corps Team Leader. The consultant reviewed records, worked with staff designing a gross motor skills screening instrument, tested 104 elementary children (K-3), assisted staff, modeled instructional strategies for handicapped kids, and designed an alternative curriculum for high school senior physical education classes. Additional outcomes included IEP's on identified children processed through PET process to insure proper implementation and follow up. |
| 2. | Special Education Management | Consultants 9 days on site | 2 UMF faculty | Special ed. staff<br>Assistant Principal | The need for inservice work in the area of special education management was assessed by the assistant principal, special education director, and Teacher Corps Team Leader during the first months of the Project. This was specifically targeted toward inservice training in IEP writing, procedural compliance with P.L. 94-142, filing systems and alternative staffing structure. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| March 21,25, 1978 | Mini-course Special Education Instructional Design | 1 UMF faculty | SAD #2<br>2 Special Ed. staff<br>4 elementary teachers | Filing and record keeping systems, current staffing patterns were reviewed and specific recommendations regarding new forms and data collection instruments were made. The IEP process was also critiqued and refined. |
| 3. Speech and Hearing | | | | |
| April 17, May 24,25, 31 & June 6, 1978 | Consultant 4 days on site | 2 UMF faculty | Speech Therapist<br>Elementary staff | At the start of the Teacher Corps Project, SAD #2 did not have a speech therapist position and it was assessed that there was a specific need for a part-time consultant to establish speech and hearing programming, as well as to inservice staff. Through the efforts of Teacher Corps and Tri-County Special Ed., a part-time position was funded in December. The Teacher Corps role then became one of inservicing this new instructor, as well as the regular classroom faculty.<br><br>A speech and language screening instrument was designed along with a written procedure for SAD #2 staff and administration to implement an ongoing speech program. Through this process roles and responsibilities of the assistant principal and special ed. director, as related to the PET process & pupil special services, were also clarified. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Speech and Hearing - continued | | | | Current speech programming was reviewed and instructional programs for mainstreamed teachers and the speech therapist designed. |
| 4. Gifted & Talented | | | | |
| February through June, 1978 | Consultants 10 days on site (including:) | 1 UMO faculty 1 State Dep't of Education staff | SAD #2 staff 8 elementary 1 secondary | Gifted Education inservice was assessed by the assistant principal, special ed. director, and Teacher Corps Team Leader during the first month of planning of the Teacher Corps Project. During Year 1, 2 consultants were contacted to provide awareness sessions, 4 mini-lessons, development of a screening procedure, a resource identification and a design for implementation. In addition, approximately $600 of instructional materials were purchased. Consultants worked individually with teachers as well as in small groups assisting staff in planning, ongoing activity setting and follow up in programming the gifted child within the regular classroom. |
| February 2 16, 1978 | - Faculty Awareness Days | | | Included individual and small group conferences with teachers on characteristics of gifted children and use of nomination instrument. |
| March 30, 1978 | - Mini-lesson "Contract Systems & Independent Study" | | | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

4. Gifted & Talented - continued

| Date | Service | Person delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| May 25, 1978 | - Mini-lessons- "Characteristics of Gifted/Talented" "Program Planning" "Learning C" | 1 UMO faculty 1 State Dep't. | SAD #2 staff 8 elementary 1 secondary | |
| June 8,9 1978 | - Evaluation & Second Year Planning | | | Abandonment of this particular plan in delivering Gifted Education In-service in Year #2 |
| c. Junior High Program | | | | |
| Fall-Winter 1977-1978 | | | | Concerns regarding the junior high school (organization, staffing patterns, curriculum, remedial reading) were expressed by SAD #2 staff and clearly surfaced through the self-evaluation process. In fact, one of the stated Project thrusts - "alternate school and curriculum designs" - was aimed at the junior high school Plans to deal with these concerns, however, never really got off the ground, due to lack of SAD #2 administrative and Teacher Corps support. Ideas and diagrams were tossed around for awhile in the fall and the junior high was originally identified as the primary audience of the individualization program. Few junior high teachers responded, however. In December, several visits were made by the principal, junior high staff and Teacher Corps core faculty. |
| December 1977 | Visits to two junior high schools | | SAD #2 junior high staff, principal, Teacher Corps staff (core faculty) | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

c. Junior High Program - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Junior high remedial reading for special needs was also identified by the assistant principal, special education director and Team Leader as one of five needs when planning the exceptionality program. A proposal was designed in February 1978 by a UMF faculty, but SAD #2 administrators rejected the proposal, feeling that the timing was inappropriate with the self-evaluation process and that the staff wasn't ready for it. Additional plans/efforts are not apparent. |
| d. Learning Resource Center<br><br>Dec.1977 through Summer 1978 | Consultant 6 days on site | 1 UMF faculty | SAD #2 personnel 3 librarians | Interest in a media center was expressed by SAD #2 staff in the fall and consultant assistance provided for the librarians. In March a time line for the establishment of a learning resource center was drawn up by the UMF consultant, SAD #2 librarian and Teacher Corps P.D.S. A workshop on media was delivered by the Teacher Corps P.D.S. in May. The consultant worked with the librarian over the summer and a media center, housed in the school library, was designed and constructed. A course on media followed in the fall. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

e. Master of Education Program

Five Greenville elementary teachers enrolled in an M.Ed. program with a concentration in exceptionality. University of Southern Maine was the degree granting campus. Some other teachers had expressed an interest but the concentration of exceptionality was of no interest to many, particularly secondary teachers and other discipline specialists. The fact that it was available was a reason for involvement for all five who enrolled in the program. As one teacher commented, "I got involved because I'm an opportunist. I couldn't pass it up." One teacher specifically wanted to become involved in special education. Money was also an incentive. It was free and a master's would mean salary increases.

The program was slow in getting off the ground. Little appeared to have been done over the first summer and when schools opened in the fall, concentrations and options available were still not known. Negotiations between Greenville, UMF and USM were unclear and communication occurred between the Coordinator of Graduate Studies at UMF and the Coordinator of the Classroom Teacher M.Ed. program at USM on an infrequent basis. Conflicting reports were heard from the Teacher Corps Project Director and the two Coordinators. Negotiations continued throughout the fall. On top of this confusion was the reality and difficulty of identifying and scheduling faculty to teach courses on top of their existing full time and often overloaded responsibilities. Identification of specific requirements, options available and faculty to deliver was not made until late fall. The first course was finally offered in January 1978.

Program requirements for Greenville teachers and interns enrolled in the M.Ed. program were identical to the requirements for teachers enrolled in the graduate program at USM. The program was simply transferred to Greenville. Requirements included 3 core courses (9 credits), 6 courses in area of concentration (18 credits, and 2 electives (6 credits.) In addition, comprehensive exams covering both the area of concentration and core courses had to be successfully completed for completion of the graduate program. The first course was offered in January, 1978 and over the next 18 months, 11 - 3 credit graduate courses and 3 - 1 credit mini-courses were offered in Greenville to teachers. A maximum of 3 courses were offered simultaneously. With the exception of one practicum, credits were equated only with courses. The first year of the Project 5 graduate courses and 3 mini-courses, totally 18 credits were offered between January and August. These courses are described on the next page.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

f. Courses/Workshops

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| All but one course delivered in Greenville the first year of the Project were offered to fulfill the requirements for the M.Ed. program. This course was offered in response to stated needs of SAD #2. | | | | |
| Winter 1978 | "Educational Tests and Measurements" 3 graduate credits | 1 UMF staff | 15 persons: 4 elem.teachers 2 secondary 4 interns 1 specialist 4 community | - offered to fulfill concentration requirement<br>- delivered in 15 - 2½ hour weekly sessions - Friday 3:00 to 5:30 p.m. |
| Winter 1978 | "Education of the Exceptional Child." 3 graduate credits | 4 UMF staff | 20 persons: 5 elem.teachers 2 specialists 4 interns 4 other | - offered to fulfill concentration requirement. Each professor delivered one section of the course.<br>- delivered in 8 - 4½ hour sessions - Wednesday afternoons and evenings |
| | Mini-courses in Exceptionality 1 graduate credit apiece | 3 UMF faculty | SAD #2 teachers 4 interns | - fulfilled concentration requirement.<br>- each mini required 8-10 contact hours, was competency based, provided for application in the field and follow up.<br>- designed as pragmatic response to inservicing regular classroom teachers in mainstreaming skills. |
| May 1, 22,1978 | "Management of Disruptive Behavior" | 1 UMF faculty | | |
| June 6, 1978 | "Task Analysis" | 1 UMF faculty | | |
| June 6,7 | "Learning Disabilities" | 1 UMF faculty | | |
| May 1, 1978 | Workshop on "Reading Management Systems" | 1 UMF faculty | SAD #2 staff | Offered in response to local needs |
| May 1, 1978 | Workshop on "Media" | 1 T.C. staff | SAD #2 staff | Responded to stated district need. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

f. Courses/Workshops - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| June 26-July 11 1978 | "Curriculum Institute" 3 graduate credits | 3 SAD #2 administrators & 1 T.C. staff (P.D.S.) | 4 elem. teachers<br>6 secondary<br>9 specialists<br>1 intern<br>2 other | The Curriculum Institute was a collaborative effort between SAD #2 administrators and Teacher Corps staff. It was designed to provide an opportunity for SAD #2 staff to receive training in curriculum development tasks that had been identified through the self-evaluation process. The planning for this was an arduous and frustrating process of collaboration between SAD #2 administrators and Teacher Corps staff, representing UMF. The major conflict centered around graduate credit, which was the IHE leverage for collaboration. The administration was not concerned with graduate credit and felt that it would only break down the stated goals of the institute. Curriculum "theory," necessary for graduate credit, was not considered a high priority by the administrators who were more concerned about curriculum "doing" and active participation. Some teachers needed credit, however, and so they compromised. Theory and practice were incorporated into the institute and 3 graduate credits awarded. Stipends were paid to teachers who participated. The institute was broken into three groups, math, language arts and voc. ed., taught by the three SAD #2 administrators. The Teacher Corps P.D.S. was also responsible for presentation of curriculum theory and the Teacher Corps Core Faculty assisted throughout the process. Originally, UMF consultants were also to provide assistance, however, SAD #2 administrators felt they were not needed. The courses were delivered in the morning for three weeks. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVER AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| August 7-23, 1978 | "Remedial Reading Institute" 3 graduage credits | 1 UMF faculty | SAD #2 staff: 5 elem. teachers 3 interns | A summer school for students with reading problems was held on July 14 through the 25th. Twenty-four 12 to 14 year olds participated. The remedial reading course was originally designed to be linked with the summer school and to use it as a laboratory. The course also fulfilled a concnetration requirement. In reality the two were not as integrated as envisioned in part due to problems in coordination and the design of the course expectations. Some students used the lab, others didn't.<br><br>The course was offered 3½ hours daily for three weeks. The instructor also provided four follow-up days in Greenville in the fall to work with staff. |
| August 21-24 & 28-31 | "Analysis of Teaching" 3 graduate credits | 1 USM faculty | 5 elementary 1 secondary 2 specialists 3 others | Offered to fulfill core requirement for M. Ed. Designed as a practical course responsive to teacher needs. Teachers were required to identify a need related to their classroom and design a plan to meet this need.<br><br>The course was offered from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. for two four day sessions with four follow-up consultation days in the fall. |

g. Conferences - A service the Teacher Corps provided was the opportunity to attend conferences related to professional needs. Project staff, as well as some school, community and university personnel took advantage of this opportunity.

| Date | Conference | Place | Participants |
|---|---|---|---|
| August 1977 | National Teacher Training Conf. | Washington, D.C. | 5 Teacher Corps staff, 2 SAD #2 administrators, 3 SAD #2 teachers, 2 UMF faculty, 2 community persons |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

g. Conferences

| Date | Conference | Place | Participants |
|---|---|---|---|
| August 1977 | Network Teacher Corps Conference | Hyannis, MA. | Teacher Corps Director, Community Coordinator SAD #2 Principal |
| September 1977 | Network Teacher Corps Special Education Conference | Concord, N.H. | 1 elementary teacher, 1 UMF |
| October 1977 | IOTA Workshop | UMO | Teacher Corps P.D.S., Team Leader, Core Faculty |
| November 1977 | ASCD Conference on Basic Skills | Montreal, Canada | Teacher Corps P.D.S. |
| November 1977 | New England Kindergarten Conference | Boston, MA. | Teacher Corps Core Faculty |
| December 1977 | Washington Policy Seminar | Washington, D.C. | Teacher Corps Director |
| February 1978 | American Association Colleges of Teacher Education | Chicago, Ill. | Teacher Corps P.D.S. |
| February 1978 | Network IHE Staff Development Conference | Boston, MA. | Teacher Corps Director, Team Leader, P.D.S., 2 UMF faculty |
| March 1978 | New England Regional Conference for Social Studies | Boston, MA. | 1 elementary teacher, 1 secondary, 1 intern |
| March 1978 | Association of Teachers of Math in Maine | Bangor, Maine | 1 UMF |
| March 1978 | American Educational Research Association | Toronto, Canada | Teacher Corps P.D.S. |
| March 1978 | National Association for Research in Science Teaching | Toronto, Canada | 1 UMF |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

g. Conferences:

| Date | Conference | Place | Participants |
|---|---|---|---|
| March 1978 | R.C.T.R. Multi-cultural Conference | Detroit, Michigan | Teacher Corps Team Leader |
| April 1978 | Group Leadership Conference | Bangor, Maine | 1 SAD #2 specialist |
| April 1978 | Westinghouse Scheduling Conference | Portsmouth, N.H. | 1 SAD #2 administrator, 1 SAD #2 specialist |
| April 1978 | Educational Secretaries Conference | Penn State, PA. | 1 Teacher Corps staff |
| April 1978 | National Science Teachers Association | Washington, D.C. | 1 UMF |
| May 1978 | Network Conference - End of the Year | Newton, MA. | 5 Teacher Corps staff, 1 intern, 1 community, 1 elementary teacher, 1 UMF |
| May 1978 | Program Evaluation Workshop | Biddeford, Maine | 2 secondary teachers, 1 administrator |
| June 1978 | National Council Teachers of English | Chicago, Ill. | 1 secondary teacher |
| August 1978 | National Teacher Corps Conference | Washington, D.C. | 5 Teacher Corps staff, 2 SAD #2 administrators, 1 elementary teacher, 1 UMF administrator |

h. Materials - Teacher Corps monies were used to purchase instructional supplies as well as equipment for the district. The first year of the Project over $4,000 were spent on instructional supplies including math, reading, science materials and subscriptions/memberships. Approximately $2,700 were spent - through LEA indirect costs - on equipment such as tables, chairs, files, etc.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

1. Intern Assistance - Interns and classroom teachers mutually planned and implemented many innovative instructional units. These cooperative efforts were often cited as one of the more positive learning experiences by teachers and facilitated many changes in instructional strategies.

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1977 | Individualizing math and reading program | 1 intern<br>1 teacher | first grade | New instructional techniques and materials designed to allow greater individualization in the math and reading program. |
| Spring 1978 | Science unit-Forestry | 1 intern<br>1 teacher | fourth grade | This unit was implemented with a special emphasis in involving local community foresters. |
| Fall 1977 | Designed independent study unit in social studies for voc.ed. students | 1 intern<br>Voc.Ed.Director | | This project was designed in a direct response for an alternative curriculum need for voc.ed. students traveling to a regional voc.ed.school. |
| Spring 1978 | Implementation of "Foxfire" type project with high school English | 2 interns<br>1 high school English teacher | high school juniors | An instructional unit using the community resources for an oral history. Students interviewed local citizens and published a book. A fund was set up to continue this experience as a regular part of the high school curriculum. |
| Spring 1978 | Team Teaching math,science curriculum packets | 1 intern<br>1 teacher | 5th grade | New instructional unit field-tested using a team teaching model. This experience complimented a science methods course. |
| Fall 1977 | Design/implementation of learning center | 1 intern,1 teacher<br>1 teacher aide | 2nd grade | A dictionary skills learning center with a wealth of material was demonstrated in a 2nd grade classroom. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Spring 1978 | Value Clarification Unit | 1 intern, 1 high school English teacher | High School Sophomores | A series of instructional units incorporated into high school English class dealing with values and decision-making. |

Evaluation of Services - In-service Component-Year #1

Participant responses to the October 3 Workshop (the first service delivered by Teacher Corps) were generally favorable. Sessions were perceived as useful by 98% of participants, ranging from somewhat to extemely useful, and 85% felt that ideas presented would probably or definitely be used by them in the classroom. The quality of presentors was rated satisfactory or better by 98% of the participants. Over 70% attended the individualized instruction workshop.

The Individualized Program sounded terrific. It didn't work, however. Responses of teachers to the October, November and December Workshops appeared to be favorable, but a breakdown occurred shortly after. The linkage between the self-evaluation/curriculum process and the individualization program (through UMF consultants) never occurred. The two were in fact, quite separate. The former attended to district needs and the latter to individual needs - which did not necessarily overlap. The consultant role in both processes was nebulous - teacher needs nor consultant roles were defined. At this stage in the development of the curriculum committee process, when committees were new and groping with the difficulties of working together (not an easy task!), defining tasks and trying to follow through, the appropriate consultant role was more of a process facilitator than a content specialist, as indicated below in an evaluation of curriculum meetings on February 27, 1978. These meetings were "facilitated" by UMF consultants.

Participant responses to the curriculum meetings on February 27 were generally favorable. Those groups that had consultant assistance reported more positive feelings in most areas questionned. Groups that came up with a more detailed plan of action or clear indication of what they were to do next had more positive feelings. Accomplishments cited included the following:

- the chance to see new material, including alternative curricula, and an overview of curricula K-12,
- sharing ideas on transfer of abstract to concrete
- setting of goals and objectives.

Lack of task definition, inability to remain on task, lack of focus, failure to plan follow-up tasks, and failure to choose a spokesperson were identified as weaknesses. Most frustrations resulted from the process of the sessions.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services - Inservice Component - Year #1 (continued)

Some consultants possessed these skills and others didn't, resulting in frustration for both teachers and consultants. The consultant role of content specialist was more appropriate when working with individual teachers, although even here some people had trouble. It is one thing to give a workshop in one's own area of expertise to a group of teachers and another to work individually with teachers and try to respond to their wants (as they perceive) and needs, as you perceive. Some consultants were comfortable in this role and some weren't. Some were able to set up their own structures and expectations within which to operate and others were not. Unrealistic promises were made by some, resulting in lack of follow through. Such problems were compounded by poor coordination and lack of follow through on the part of the Teacher Corps staff and a lack of active support by both SAD #2 administration and Teacher Corps staff. Little assistance was provided for UMF consultants. The program eventually just fizzled out.

Despite difficulties and a disintegrating program, consultant assistance provided by UMF faculty was appreciated by SAD #2 staff and was consistently cited by many the first year of the Project as a major Project strength. The following specific comments were about useful consultant behaviors:

"He really listens."
"He brought materials into the classroom."
"The consultant worked with my kids."
"Demonstrations were given."
"He took needs, listening to teachers' concerns and addressed these concerns through the subject matter."
"He supplied books and resources at our request."

The Exceptionality Program was a planned, collaborative effort involving SAD #2, Teacher Corps and UMF staff which was designed to respond to local needs. Services were adapted as needs changed. Evaluative data, although limited, indicates that services were delivered, objectives were met and the responses of many participants were positive. At the close of the year, several SAD #2 faculty cited the exceptionality program as a major accomplishment of the Project.

Eight courses, including three mini-courses were offered the first year of the Project. Four were responded to very favorably, two were mixed, and two negative. Participant reactions to the effectiveness of the instructor ranged from "He's the best instructor we've had from UMF," to "I wouldn't take the course again" (because of the professor.) The following positive comments were made by participants:

- Lots of handouts were provided.
- Each lesson is well prepared and outlined.
- Professor is good about reviewing and giving an opportunity for questions.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services-In-service Component-Year #1 (continued)

-He allows and welcomes the freedom of expression and also the fielding of questions.
-The instructor involved the students from the start.
-The instructor seemed expert on the subject.
-The instructor outlined objectives and expectations from the start.
-Interesting and amusing manner of presentation.
-He really gets into (the subject matter) and made it fun and interesting.
-The fact that we wrote a book that could be used in the classroom for part of the test (evaluation) shows its appropriateness.
-The assignment was relevant, field based.
-No baloney but hands on material that is useful in the classroom.
-I feel the book will have lasting value as a reference book - something most helpful since you usually don't see a text after the course is over.
-The instructor left a telephone number where she could be reached at any time, including home phone.
-The instructor was human and admitted he was nervous too, at the first session.
-Provided very specific feedback - positives and negatives.
-Gave us ideas and then we went out and tried them.
-Provided the opportunity to work in the clinic.
-The course was personalized and on a concrete level.

And Negative:

-The course was too close to the end of the year to practice the skills.
-Wanted to be responsive but was lazy, absolutely no preparation.
-His objectives were clear to me. The problem is that his objectives and my needs did not make a good marriage.
-A more meaningful evaluation that would have allowed us to apply what we learned would have been better than asking us to regurgitate everything we read.
-His lecture could have been aimed at M.D.'s, but they would need a bionic arm to write fast enough to get 50% of what the instructor said.
-Most of the lecture was based on materials and methods nearly all the people in the class knew from teaching experience or other courses.
-I expected the field-based experiences to be more relevant.
-Why can't the rules by changed a little to fit Greenville's objectives and needs?
-I really think that outlining more distinct objectives at the outset of the semester and sticking to them would have helped the class immensely.
-The biggest problem is my fatigue.
-More discussion of text would be useful,
-I would have preferred the course at another time than 3:00 - 5:30 on Friday.
-The boring lecture was damn near verbatim from a big black looseleaf notebook.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services,-In-service Component-Year #1 (continued)

-Ho-hum job attitude.
-If it had been more of a "learning by doing" type of presentation it would have been more stimulating and motivating.
-Tests were never returned.
-Since he is available only one day, the time for discussion is limited to before class and after.
-The professor viewed us as college freshman rather than experienced teachers.
-The course was too high a level for me - too abstract and not related to my teaching.

Courses and workshops which provided the opportunity to apply skills or information gained were regarded more highly than those which merely supplied information. Other instructional strategies that were positively viewed included opportunities for feedback, questioning and discussion, involvement of participants and provision of handouts. Instructor knowledge of and interest in subject matter and students, and clear objectives and expectations were also cited as necessary foundations of effective courses.

In contrast, straight lectures, unclear or nonexistent objectives and lack of planning and organization were viewed negatively. Tests which merely required regurgitations of facts were considered useless by some. Scheduling also proved to be a problem with some courses. Friday afternoons and the end of the school year were not the most opportune times for teacher involvement in courses.

The mini-course format was generally favorable received by teachers. 11 of 17 respondents stated that they preferred this format to regular 3 credit courses. The remaining 6 had no preference, 10 of 14 felt that the mini-course format gave them an opportunity to practice these skills in the classroom. Two of the three mini-courses were responded to very positively by participants and all cited one or more of the minis they had taken as among the best services delivered by the Teacher Corps. Strengths included skills and information applicable to the classroom, high quality of instruction, instructor concern about students, and provision of feedback. The primary weakness was the time of the year (late spring.) One course was considered too basic.

The overall response to the Summer Curriculum Institute was very positive, largely due to the active involvement of teachers and student free time. Two particularly valuable aspects were the provision of long blocks of uninterrupted time to work on curriculum planning and the opportunity for teachers to interact with others and share ideas. Other identified strengths included the task orientation of the workshop, cooperative attitudes, relevancy of activities, flexibility of scheduling to meet teachers' needs, availability of assistance, writing objectives, systematic approach to curriculum design and the opportunity to visit local business. One of its greatest weaknesses was lack of time, many participants would have liked more than two weeks. Participants were almost unanimous in their call for a continuation of this type of work during the school year. Student free time was cited as a necessity in order to do this. The desire to disseminate what was done and to involve other teachers was also expressed.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Evaluation of Services, In-service Component-Year #1 (continued) | The Media Center was used by many teachers and students and was cited by many as an important, tangible accomplishment of the Project<br><br>Intern Assistance was repeatedly and highly praised by teachers throughout the Project. Several teachers commented that the most useful service provided was the interns! |
| Summary of Services Delivered through In-service Component-Year #1 | Major inservice efforts the first year of the Project were the Inserv process, the individualization process, the exceptionality program and courses. The Inserv process got bogged down in its own process and crept to a halt. The individualization program fizzled out as coordination, assistance and follow up drooped. The exceptionality program rooted itself in the district and flourished, and courses - after a slow start - finally came on the scene in December, in abundance. In total:<br><br>-21 UMF faculty from 6 different departments (including the Dean of Education,) 1 UMO faculty, 1 USM faculty and 1 consultant from the State Department have provided services to Greenville over the past year.<br>-8 graduate courses, including 3 mini-courses, totalling 18 credits were offered between February and August.<br>-5 of 44 SAD #2 faculty enrolled in a M.Ed. program.<br>-24 of 44 Greenville faculty enrolled in 1 or more courses.<br>-20 Greenville faculty were assisted by consultants.<br>-12 SAD #2 faculty attended 8 conferences out of Greenville.<br>-5 UMF faculty attended 8 conferences<br>-Of 8 courses offered, 4 were responded to favorably, 2 were mixed and 2 negative. |
| 1. Inservice Component Year #2<br><br>a. Curriculum Development | The primary vehicles for assessing teacher and district needs and delivering services the second year of the Project were the SAD #2 curriculum committees, composed of teachers and administrators and led by teachers. This marked a major transition from the first year of the Project and the individualization/curriculum effort. School administrators, primarily the assistant principal, designed a system for ongoing curriculum development, extending from the self-evaluation process and the summer curriculum institute. A process was also designed by the Teacher Corps staff (primarily the P.D.S.) but given a low trust level and conflict between Teacher Corps staff and SAD #2 administration and a strong desire of SAD #2 to do it their own way, the Teacher Corps plan was never really given serious consideration. It is interesting to note that the plans were, in fact, almost identical. The SAD #2 plan called for the continuation of curriculum committees and a chairperson overseer group which would monitor the curriculum development effort. Decisions as to district needs as well as individual teacher needs were to be determined by the curriculum committees and approved by the chairpersons. The Teacher Corps thus began to play a more reactive role toward inservice training. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVLAUATION OF SERVICES - continued

1. Inservice Component Year #2

a. Curriculum Development (continued)

The assessment of needs basically came from the committees and the administration. The role of the Teacher Corps was one of provision of monies to support services identified by committees and assistance upon request, and was basically passive rather than active due in part to a passive stance (waiting for requests) of the P.D.S., who was given the responsibility of identifying potential services and disseminating to teachers as appropriate; in part due to strong ownership of the process by SAD #2; and in part due to conflict between core faculty (who initially attempted to take a more active role) and the assistant principal. Active assessment and sharing of services and materials which might meet identified needs did not occur. The new Team Leader, a former Greenville teacher, played an important and active role as link between the Teacher Corps and SAD #2, assessing needs as well as assisting the assistant principal in planning, designing meetings and documentation.

Services provided by the Teacher Corps, in response to needs of curriculum committees are reviewed below:

| | Date | Service | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Language Arts Committee | March/ April,1979 | ECRI Visitation-Newport Elem.School | Newport Ass't.Princ. and T.C.Field Based Instructor | 2 elem.teachers & 1 secondary | Key members of the language arts committee sent to observe and feed back information. Pilot program in second grade implemented. |
| | February 1979 | Listening Skills Workshop | 2 UMF faculty | Elementary staff | A one shot two hour workshop after school as part of a consultanship contract with the speech department. Awareness session and resource identification. No systematic follow-up |
| | March 1979 | National Conf.Sec. English Teachers-Pittsburgh, Penna. | | Secondary teacher | One secondary staff on the language arts committee sent to National Conference to identify and feedback current secondary programming. Staff now in process of reviewing and rewriting 7-12 objectives. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY, AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Language Arts Committee (continued) | Fall,1978 Spring, 1979 | Materials purchased for secondary class | Teacher Corps Director | 2 secondary teachers | The materials purchased were designed to support various unit plans that were being implemented by the secondary staff. This included a set of video tapes for Shakespeare and poetry units. These units have been incorporated into the curriculum. |
| | January-June 1979 | Committee organizational support | Team Leader Year #2 4 | Elementary staff - 5 secondary | The Team Leader was responsible for the continual update on curriculum notebooks, resource identification, and keeping the committee on task. |
| | Fall-Spring 1978-1979 | Elementary French Program | Assistant Principal 1 elementary teacher, & T.C.P.D.S. | Elementary staff | This activity identified and piloted the elementary French program in Potsdam, N.Y. and adopted its use in the elementary school. The program consisted of video tapes and workbooks, now fully in place in the elementary school. |
| (2) Science Committee | November 1978 | SCISS Visitation-Dow Lane School, Bangor | | Principal 2 elementary P.D.S. | A select group from the science committee sent to review the day-to-day operation of the SCISS curriculum. |
| | March 1979 | Inservice Workshop on SCISS materials | 1 UMF staff | Elementary staff | Initial training with SCISS materials, teacher awareness, and some pilot experience with the materials in some classes. Outcome-decision to purchase SCISS. |
| | April 1979 | Materials purchased K-6 SCISS Science curriculum | | elementary staff | Materials purchased to implement a new K-6 science curriculum. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (2) Science Committee (continued) | April 1979 | Health Education Workshop, Rural Education Conference, Greenville | 1 HERC staff | 1 secondary<br>1 elementary<br>Assistant Principal | As part of the Rural Educuation Conference, selected committee members attended a session on health education programs designed as an awareness of the committee's new emphasis in this area. Outcome-submission of a HERC grant to implement a health curriculum. |
| | January-June 1979 | Organization Support | Team Leader Year #2 | 3 elementary<br>3 secondary | The Team Leader was responsible for the continual update on curriculum notebook, resource identification and keeping the committee on task. |
| (3) Math Committee | February-March 1979 | Calculators Adv.math consultanship & materials | P.D.S. | 1 secondary | The P.D.S. and the high school advanced math teacher worked a curriculum using newly purchased programmable calculators. This curriculum is now in place in the high school advanced math classes. |
| | January-June 1979 | Math Committee organizational support | Team Leader Year #2 | 3 elementary<br>3 secondary | The Team Leader was responsible for the continual update on curriculum notebooks resource i.d. and keeping the committee on task. |
| (4) Social Studies Committee | March 1979 | Working sessions at N.E. Conf.for the Social Studies. | 1 UMO staff | Team Leader Year #2<br>2 elementary<br>1 secondary<br>2 interns | A select group of social studies committee members were sent to the National Conference to review curriculum material and make a recommendation on adopting a particular series. The committee feedback was presented to their Social Studies committee. A decision was later reached to implement the Scott-Foresman curriculum K-8. |
| | May 1979 | Inservice Workshop S.S.materials | Consultant-Scott Foresman Co. | Staff-K-8 | Initial training with materials. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Services | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (4) Social Studies Committee (continued) | May 1979 | Scott Foresman Social Studies Program Materials Purchase | | Staff K-8 | Materials purchased to compliment a new K-8 social studies curriculum |
| | Jan.-June 1979 | Committee Organizational support | Team Leader Year #2 | Social Studies Committee | Team Leader was responsible for the continual update of curriculum notebook resource I.D. and keeping the committee on task. |
| (5) Curriculum Resource Development | April 1979 | Visitation Searsport Teaching Center | | 1 elementary Team Leader Year #2 | This visit was designed to acquaint participants of possible formats in implementing a curriculum resource file. |
| | April 1979 | Teacher Curriculum Center | SAD #2 Librarian | Team Leader Year #2 | A one to one consultanship designed to implement filing organization design, and procedures for the elementary curriculum resource room. |
| | Jan.-June | Curriculum Materials I.D. & listing | Team Leader Year #2 | | The Team Leader researched various curriculum materials, did faculty surveys on materials and implemented a curriculum resource library. |
| (6) Chairpeople Training | March-May, 1979 | Organization consultant (4 days) | 1 consultant (T.C.evaluator) | Chairpeople Committee & School Administrators | A needs assessment was conducted, and ongoing observations, feedback and recommendations made to school administrators. |
| | January 1979 | Leadership Workshops | Assistant Principal | Chairpeople Committee | This was designed to introduce leadership and curriculum development skills to committee members. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Services | person responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (6) Chairpeople Training (continued) | May-June 1979 | Supervision Course | 1 USM staff | 2 administrators<br>Team Leader #2<br>3 secondary<br>1 elementary | A graduate course designed to help those chairpeople participating to acquire curriculum supervision skills. |
| | Jan.-June 1979 | Organization support | Team Leader #2 | Chairpeople | Team Leader was responsible for organization concerns, agendas, notebooks, budget, identifying inservice needs & documentation |
| (7) Vocational Education Committee | Sept.-Nov. 1978 | Trends in Voc.Ed. 3 credit course | 1 USM staff | 1 administrator<br>2 secondary<br>2 community | This undergraduate course was designed as an experienced-based review of current voc.ed. curriculum throughout the state. |
| | April 1979 | Voc.Ed. Workshop at Rural Conference | 3 consultants | Voc.Ed.Committee<br>1 administrator<br>3 secondary<br>2 special | This workshop was designed as awareness session for reviewing alternative delivery systems for rural vocational education. |
| | February 1979 | Survey-Needs Assessment | Team Leader #2 | Voc.Ed.Committee | The Team Leader instituted a comprehensive assessment of staff needs and opinion for program development. |
| (8) Special Areas | Ongoing 1978-1979 | Assistance | Field-based Instructor | 1 specialist | Assistance was provided in writing objectives for art curriculum and gathering materials. |
| b. Exceptionality Program | The exceptionality program, initiated the first year of the Project, continued the second. | | | | |
| (1) Motor Development | Oct. 1978 through May '79 | Consultant 20 days(17) days on site in Greenville | 1 UMF faculty | 2 physical ed.<br>3 special ed.<br>2 elementary | A proposal was submitted to the P.S.C. by the Teacher Corps in the fall for continuation of the program. The consultant observed and provided feedback |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Services | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Motor Development (continued | | | | | to physical education teachers, demonstrated skills with children in classrooms, worked with handicapped children, worked with teachers with handicapped children in their rooms, provided materials and assisted in planning. The following was accomplished:<br>-completion of screening procedure 4-6<br>-institutionalization of screening process via PET team and school adm.<br>-establishment of grade level objectives and activities for physical ed. classes<br>-development of process to create alternative curriculum for handicapped students<br>-continued refinement of junior high and senior high program offerings, particularly in the area of lifetime activities and use of local recreational resources<br>-facilities and equipment adaptive for instruction in fine and gross motor skills. |
| (2) Special Education Management | March 1979 | Special Education Audit-Workshop 2½ days | Assistant Principal | 1 administrator<br>1 counselor<br>5 special ed.<br>2 other<br>SAD #2 staff | As preparation for the State Department audit the staff met to review files, assessment instruments, placement of exceptional children, PET procedures classification and documentation and state and federal regulations. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Services | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (3) Speech and Hearing | Nov.-April 1978-1979 | Consultants-4 days on site | 2 UMF faculty | Speech therapist<br>1 spec. ed.<br>1 administrator | The consultants worked with the speech therapist in development of an organizational handbook describing an ongoing SAD #2 speech program. Assistance regarding screening and therapy was also provided and roles of speech therapist Director of Special Ed. and Assistant Principal clarified. |
| | February 1979 | Teacher Workshop | 2 UMF faculty speech therapist | Elementary staff | This workshop served as a teacher awareness session as well to develop listening skills. |
| | February 1979 | Visitation to UMF | | Speech Therapist | Materials were gathered. |
| | April 1979 | CUED Speech Workshop in Waterville | | Speech Therapist<br>1 elementary | A program was planned for next year for a particular student. |
| (4) Gifted and Talented | Sept.-June 1978-1979 | GIFT team | Assistant Principal (chairman) | 4 elementary<br>2 special<br>1 secondary<br>Team Leader #2 | A proposal for extension of work begun the previous year was submitted to the P.S.C. in November. The vehicle for such inservice development was a local teacher committee - the GIFT team, headed by the assistant principal. A screening procedure was identified, a program designed and action plans drawn up. Out of state conferences were attended by some committee members to gather materials and identify resources and programs in gifted education. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| (4) Gifted and Talented (continued) | Date | Services | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | March 1979 | Speaker-Tri-County Regional Inservice Day,Milo | Consultant-State University College, Buffalo,N.Y. | GIFT Team 6 community 600 area teachers | The Teacher Corps was involved in the planning of the day and provided personnel assistance as well as $2,000. |
| | April 1979 | Gifted Conference, Boston | | SAD #2 counselor | |
| | April 1979 | National Council on Giftedness,Atlantic City,N.J. | | 2 elementary Team Leader #2 | |
| | May 1979 | Gifted Conference - Portland,ME. | | Assistant Principal | |

C. Minicourse Project

Minicourses were originally designed by UMF staff as a pragmatic approach to inservicing local school personnel. A minicourse is a one credit course requiring 8 to 10 hours of contact time, designed to develop a specific skill or knowledge related to improving classroom instruction. It is delivered on site and my be taught by persons other than the developer, after some training. A minicourse provides for reading and discussion, application of skills in the classroom, and follow up feedback. Participation is limited to 10 persons.

In 1975-78 four minicourses were taught throughout Maine. Three of these were taught in Greenville the first year of the Project and the Teacher Corps supported the writing of five others. The minicourse Project was formed in the fall, 1978, to promote the continued development and field testing of minicourses. The staff consisted of a UMF special education professor (and original founder of the concept,) the Teacher Corps field based instructor, and an outside consultant (also the Teacher Corps Project evaluator/documentor.) All staff worked part time only on the Project. The Project was supported by monies from the Teacher Corps and a BEH grant awarded to the Special Education Department. Meetings were held bi-weekly throughout the fall to define objectives, identify realistic parameters of what was and was not feasible and clarify roles. It was a slow process, heightened by three persons, each working part time on the Project, learning to work together, to understand each other's perspectives and agendas and working styles.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

c. Minicourse Project (continued)

The following was accomplished prior to Christmas: (1) A chart depicting Project outcomes, roles and time lines was constructed; (2) A minicourse overview, including background, intent and procedures for development and field testing was written and disseminated to appropriate persons; (3) All written mini's were reviewed by staff and writers contacted to update on Project and assess interest in teaching, preferences for time, location, etc. The intent of the Project was to get all targeted minis written to field test as many as possible, and to train a minimum of one group of local persons to teach at least one minicourse. Two primary sites - Greenville and SAD #17/39/44 area - were identified for delivery and one secondary site - Hollis/Kennebunkport. Staff were working in these areas and they were chosen for that reason.

Throughout the winter staff provided assistance to the developers, reviewing written minicourses, offering suggestions, prodding, encouraging, etc. Seven UMF staff were assisted and five new minicourses and one revised minicourse were written.

By June the following was accomplished:

- five minicourses were field tested by the developers in six locations in Maine,
- three minicourses were taught by eight persons other than the developer, including six school-based persons, a UMS special education professor and a Project staff person,
- one minicourse was taught eight times to eight groups of persons by six school-based persons, a UMF professor and the developer,
- five school-based persons were trained by the developer to teach a minicourse,
- six minicourses were edited and published.

Of these minicourses, three were taught in the Greenville area - two at the Tri-county Regional Inservice Day and one in Greenville. In February 1979, Greenville teacher interest was assessed by the field based instructor through a questionnaire. Four teachers indicated an interest in one course "Managing Student Behavior." A meeting was then held with the Jackman principal to assess interest, followed by a questionnaire to teachers. Six teachers indicated an interest in "Managing Student Behavior." Other courses evoked minimal interest. This course was scheduled in April and May, taught by the Greenville assistant principal who had taken the course previously.

Two minicourses, 'Reading to Children" and "Moral Education," were taught at the Tri-county Regional Inservice Day in Milo on March 16. Four courses which had not yet been field tested were presented as options, but interest was sufficient to offer only these two. Several Greenville persons attended, along with faculty from surrounding districts.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | |
|---|---|
| c. Minicourse Project (continued) | At the close of the Project, two meetings were held with UMF Dean of Education and Dean of Public Services to discuss possible continuation of minicourse training and development. Four sites for continued development, focusing on training of local school personnel were identified and immediate plans made. Although monies are limited, both deans support the continued development of the Project and the Dean of Public Services offered office space, phone and secretarial help. A professor from the Special Education Department will continue to spend ¼ time on work with minicourses. |
| d. Local Staff Development Process | The emplacement of a local staff development process was identified as a major inservice goal in the Year II proposal, written in May, 1978, and again in October as the staff redefined goals for the final year of the Project. The Inserv process piloted the first year by the Teacher field based instructor was an attempt at an ongoing inservice process, but it failed due to an overly cumbersome and unresponsive process. The intent of this process, however, was similar to one already developed and refined by the State Department and the Teacher Corps Director referred the core faculty to a consultant from the State Department who visited Greenville in January 1978 to discuss possibilities for a L.S.D.P (Local Staff Development Program.) A meeting was also scheduled in February 1978 to design strategies for the establishment of a L.S.D.P. and to set up time lines.<br><br>Nothing appeared to happen. Volunteers were also requested by the field based instructor in July to work on a design group. Again, nothing appears to have happened. That summer a plan was drawn up by the director for developing a L.S.D.P. and training adjacent districts.<br><br>Following the director's resignation this plan was presented as a proposal to the P.S.C. in October 1978 by the field based instructor. It was rejected, however, for a variety of reasons. Some saw no need for the plan and certainly not the dissemination to other districts. Others viewed it as belonging to the director, and with him gone support was nonexistent. In addition, the linkage between the already existing curriculum effort and a L.S.D.P. - which were in fact similar - had not been made by Teacher Corps staff and SAD #2 support was lacking. The program was viewed as a duplication of effort and unnecessarily complicated. Conflicts between Teacher Corps staff and the assistant principal compounded the problem. Despite the rejection of this proposal, the design of an ongoing staff development process which would remain in Greenville following the withdrawal of the Teacher Corps was cited as a major inservice goal of the Teacher Corps with the core faculty (now called field based instructor) assuming responsibility.<br><br>Nothing was done however, until March when the Teacher Corps field based instructor reviewed the L.S.D. process with curriculum chairpersons. Four meetings were then held with school people to reassess and generate interest of SAD #2 staff and Greenville Teacher Association. On May 23, 1979 an initial meeting was held for anyone interested in writing a draft. The principal, three secondary teachers, three elementary teachers, the librarian, a community person and a board member formed the L.S.D. committee, with a teacher chairing. The effort now belonged to SAD #2. Three meetings followed and a rough draft of a plan written. What happens now is up to SAD #2. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| e. Courses and Workshops | Date | Services | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fall 1978 | "Instructional Media" 3 graduate credits | 1 UMF staff | 5 elementary staff<br>1 intern<br>2 special<br>6 other | Offered in response to teacher needs and interests in knowledge and skills in instructional media - Thursdays - 3:00 to 7:00 p.m. - 8 sessions |
| | Nov.-Jan. 1978-'79 | "Trends in Vocational Education" 3 undergrad. credits | 1 USM staff | 3 special<br>2 other | Offered in response to needs of administrators and teachers - four meetings - 3:00-6:00 Friday p.m. and 10:00 to 2:00 Saturdays |
| | Winter 1978-1979 | "Practicum in Exceptionality" 3 graduate credits | 1 UMF staff | 2 elementary staff<br>3 interns<br>1 special | Fulfills concentration requirement for M.Ed. Designed as vehicle to provide filed-based practical experience. Started with consultantship of instructor in Greenville and then evolved into a course. Introductory meeting was held to design individual programs with students. Four sessions were then held individually with students. |
| | Jan.-April 1979 | "Philosophy of Education" 3 graduate credits | 1 USM staff | 4 elementary staff<br>4 interns, 1 special,2 others | Core requirement for M. Ed. Offered in two four day sessions, three hours per day, in January and April, with a two day midpoint meeting. |
| | Jan.-April 1979 | "Psychology of the Adult Learner" 3 graduate credits | 1 Teacher Corps staff-Director | 3 elementary staff<br>1 intern | Offered to meet intern's need for graduate course in adult education 12 meetings/3 hour sessions |
| | December-June 1978-'79 | "Research & the Teacher" 3 grad.cr. | 1 Teacher Corps staff-P.D.S. | 7 elementary staff<br>1 other | Core requirement for M.Ed.-12 weeks/ Tuesdays 3:00-6:00 p.m. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

e. Courses and Workshops

| Date | Services | Person Responsible | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| March 16, 1979 | Regional Tri-County Inservice Day, Milo -2 minicourses "Moral Education" "Reading to Children" | 1 UMF staff T.C.Field-based Instr. | | Offered through Minicourse Project |
| May 1979 | "Managing Student Behavior" (Minicourse-1 CEU) | Assistant Principal, Greenville | 4 SAD #2 staff 6 Jackman | Offered through Minicourse Project |
| May-June 1979 | "Evaluation & Supervision of School Personnel" 3 grad.cr. | 1 USM staff | 3 elementary staff 2 special 2 secondary 6 others | Offered in response to stated interests of school administrators and others-six two day sessions, tried variety of things, including 5 hour evening sessions, 2hours in a.m. |

f. Master of Education Program

The second year of the Project six graduate courses (described above) were offered in Greenville, totalling 36 credits delivered over the lifespan of the Project. Coordination of the program was shared by the Teacher Corps P.D.S. and the Field-based Instructor. A support system for teachers enrolled in the M.Ed. program was provided by the field-based instructor who assisted teachers in a variety of ways including: (1) securing books/materials, (2) delivering information to and from UMF/Greenville, (3) linking and clarifying assignments, (4) checking up on course registrations and contracts, (5) arranging schedules for professors, (6) straightening out grades, (7) pushing teachers to complete work, (8) reading and commenting on teachers' papers, (9) offereing encouragement and support.

The culminating requirement for completion of the M.Ed. program was a comprehensive exam consisting of two questions covering the area of concentration and the core courses. In May a four hour comprehensive exam was given to all the interns and teachers in the program. Two UMF faculty designed and evaluated the exceptionality section and the Teacher Corps P.D.S. and a USM professor designed and evaluated the core section. According to all teachers, they were reassured prior to

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

f. Masters of of Education Program

the exam that "no one ever flunks comps" and told not to worry about it. However, five of nine persons, including three teachers, flunked one or both sections of the exam. Persons who failed were given the option of retaking the exam and responding to different, although related, questions. All but one teacher did so and passed. Four of the five teachers who entered the program in September, 1977, were awarded a masters degree with a concentration in exceptionality in June, 1979. The four Teacher Corps interns also received degrees.

g. Conferences

| Date | Conference | Location | Audience |
|---|---|---|---|
| October 1978 | Festival of Children's Literature | UMF | T.C. Core faculty<br>1 community person<br>2 interns<br>4 elementary staff<br>1 special |
| November 1978 | Teacher Corps Dissemination Meeting | Washington, D.C. | Teacher Corps P.D.S. |
| | International Congress for Individualized Instruction | Waco, Texas | 1 UMF staff |
| | Nat'l Council of States for Inservice Ed. | San Francisco California | T.C. Core Faculty |
| December 1978 | Washington Policy Seminar | Washington, D.C. | Teacher Corps Director |
| | Multicultural Conference | Boston, MA. | P.D.S. and one student |
| January 1979 | Policy Seminar | Washington,D.C. | P.D.S. and evaluator |
| | T.C.Network meeting-Core Concepts | Hartford,CN. | Director |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

g. Conferences

| Date | Conference | Location | Audience |
|---|---|---|---|
| February 1979 | Financial Aid Conference | Boston, MA. | one SAD #2 staff |
| | Assistant Principal's Conference | New York, N.Y. | Assistant Principal |
| | American Association College Teachers' Education | Chicago, IL. | P.D.S., Director and Team Leader #2 |
| | E.E.R.A. | Charleston, S.C. | P.D.S., and one UMF staff |
| | National Inservice Network | Portland, Maine | Core Faculty |
| | Gifted Conference | Boston, MA. | 1 SAD #2 special staff |
| March 1979 | Institute for Curriculum Development | | 1 UMF |
| | New England Regional Conference on Social Studies | Boston, MA. | Team Leader #2, 3 elementary teachers 1 secondary teacher, 1 UMF staff, 1 UMO staff, 2 interns |
| | Gifted/Talented Conference | Atlantic City, N.J. | Team Leader #2, 2 elementary teachers |
| | National Council Teachers of English | Pittsburgh, Pa. | 1 secondary teacher |
| | Professional Guidance Conference | Portland, ME. | 1 UMF staff |
| April 1979 | Rural Education Conf-erence | Greenville,ME. Director res-ponsible | participants included 18 SAD #2 faculty |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

g. Conferences (continued)

The Rural Education Conference was intended to "initiate a renewed awareness of the value and positive attributes in rural education and small schools." New ideas and programs modeled in rural schools were demonstrated and discussions concerning policy alternatives which can help rural schools initiated. Representatives from a wide variety of groups/organizations in Maine were involved in the planning of the conference and over 80 presentations by 27 persons were made.

| Date | Conference | Location | Audience |
|---|---|---|---|
| April (continued) 1979 | Parent Counseling Conference | Waltham, MA. | T.C. Field Based Instructor |
| | New England Community Education Conference | Storrs, CN. | T.C. Director and one intern |
| May 1979 | T.C. Network Year End Conference | Newton, MA. | 7 T.C. staff, 3 interns, 1 teacher, 6 community, 1 USM |
| | Multicultural Network Conference | Boston, MA. | T.C. Community Coordinator, 1 UMF, 1 community, T.C. Director |
| | Counseling the Adult Learner | Bangor, ME. | T.C. Director and one intern |
| June 1979 | T.C. Network Principal's Forum | Boston, MA. | Principal |

h. Materials

Over $5,000 of educational supplies and $3,000 of equipment were purchased the second year of the Project.

i. Intern Assistance

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1978 | Research Library Skills Unit | 1 intern 1 H.S.English teacher | H.S.juniors | A unit focusing in on the writing of a composition term paper. The unit used field trips to UMO library to have students experience the necessary library and research skills. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

1. Intern Assistance Year #2 (continued)

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Spring 1979 | Team Teaching Social Studies | 1 intern<br>1 H.S. social studies teacher | High School students | Various instructional methods including role playing, simulation, debate and problem solving were incorporated into an 8 week social studies unit. |
| Fall 1978 | Individualizing multi-level (K-4) reading science curriculum | 1 intern<br>1 elementary teacher | elementary students | A cooperative effort in developing an individualized program for a small one room rural school (K-4) with 13 students. |
| Spring 1979 | Field testing ESS materials | 1 intern<br>2 elementary teachers | elementary students | Intern and elementary teachers experimented with a new science curriculum program. |
| Fall 1978 | Creative Writing-poetry curriculum unit | 1 intern<br>2 elementary teachers | 6th grade students | An instructional unit in creative writing and poetry was implemented for 6th students. A curriculum booklet for teachers and a poetry book for students were published. |
| Fall 1978 | Children's Theater | 1 intern<br>1 H.S. English teacher | secondary students | A plan to introduce drama and children's literature into the curriculum and provide the opportunities for secondary students to perform for the elementary school. |
| Spring 1979 | Behavioral Management | 1 intern<br>1 elementary teacher | elementary students | A program which used both individual and whole class activities in dealing with friendship, appreciating ourselves and others and resolving conflicts. |
| Spring 1979 | "The Human Body" Unit development | 1 intern<br>2 elementary teachers | elementary students | A curriculum including films, field trips, discussion designed to create an awareness and appreciation of the human body |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | |
|---|---|
| j. Linkage of students and community persons | Several teachers were assisted by the Community Coordinator who linked students with community persons, as part of curricular projects, and got community people into the classroom. |
| Evaluation of Services-In-service Component-Year #2 | The second year of the Project the Curriculum Committees became more highly focused and organized, largely due to efforts of curriculum chairpersons, assistant principal and Team Leader. Activities identified by the committees - although not numerous - were delivered, through Teacher Corps money. One activity which was particularly successful and useful was the Northeast Conference for the Social Studies, attended by members of the Social Studies Committee. Prior to the conference, the group met to clarify what information they needed to select a social studies program and what they wanted to get out of the conference. They were also assisted by a consultant from UMO who acted as content specialist and task master. Their action at the conference was thus well organized, focused and productive. The outcome was the selection of a social studies program, which was later adopted by the school system.<br><br>Throughout the year the chairpersons of the Curriculum Committees met monthly with administrators to discuss objectives, activities, etc. Starting in January, with the assistance of an outside consultant, the group began a process of reassessing and clarifying goals, expectations, roles and authority (who has it!) This dialogue was perceived by members of the group as helpful and necessary. By the close of the year the group had grown into a supportive, cohesive body, representing the rest of the school population, and steps to take the following year were clearly identified. According to the consultant, the evolution of the group and the commitment of the teachers was impressive to see.<br><br>Services delivered through the Exceptionality Program - as the first year - were designed in response to local needs through collaborative effort of SAD #2 participants and consultants. Objectives were successfully met and services responded to very favorably by participants. Motor Development services, in particular, were cited by some as one of the greatest accomplishments of the Project. The following assistance was considered particularly useful:<br>- being onside in Greenville as early as 7:30 a.m.<br>- demonstrating skills with kids in the classroom ("He comes up and does it and makes us see we can do it.")<br>- providing materials<br>- observing staff, giving practical, concrete feedback.<br><br>Few minicourses were taught in Greenville due to course "supersaturation." Teachers simply weren't interested. However, the development of minicourses progressed considerably through the Minicourse Project. Evaluations of all minicourses, by instructor as well as participants, were consistently favorable. Minicourses were viewed as useful and desirable inservice tools which could be replicated by local school-based personnel. The following useful characteristics were cited: |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services-In-Service Component-Year #2

- "Sharing with other teachers. I teach in a rural school, where there is only one teacher per grade and I found that discussing problems and solutions with other teachers in the class was useful."
- "Our class size of five made the course very cohesive and we all had ample opportunity to discuss and share our problems and ideas."
- "Being held on location and immediately after school meant time was saved that was usually taken up traveling."
- "I liked the limited number of sessions. Geography and weather prohibit those of us in Jackman from traveling great distances on a weekly basis."
- "The course was useful because it aimed right at my present class."
- "The course was unusually good since our own guidance counselor taught the class and was available for suggestions and even observations if necessary."
- "The mimeo sheets and articles to read helped to reinforce what we had learned in class."

As indicated by these comments, the minicourse format of design and delivery, characterized by limited number of sessions, limited number of participants, on-site delivery, application of skills in the classroom, delivery by local school-based personnel as well as university personnel, and provision of readings/worksheets, was responded to extremely favorably by participants. One person commented that "It's the best concept in teacher education in a long time." The active involvement of participants and the opportunity to share which the minicourse format allows and promotes was viewed by a majority of respondents as a particularly useful characteristic of the courses. Minicourses taught by local school personnel were responded to equally as favorably as those taught by the original developer. Most minicourses appeared to result in change in behavior of participants, as well as increased awareness.

Lack of time and poor scheduling (9 of 12 minicourses from which evaluations were received were taught between April and June) were the most frequently cited weaknesses of minicourses offered. According to most teachers fall or winter is much preferable as it allows time for continued implementation of skills.

As the Project closes, continued minicourse development and training has been endorsed by the Deans of Public Services and Education at UMF and plans for continuation made.

Near to the close of the Project something was finally done regarding the development of a Local Staff Development Process. It was slow in getting off the ground but a committee on staff development was formed and an initial rough draft of a design drawn up. Only time will tell whether or not enough SAD #2 ownership was built to ensure continuity.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services-In-Service Component-Year #2 (continued)

Seven three credit courses were delivered in Greenville the second year of the Project. Attempts were made to "field base" the courses, relating course content to teachers' realities. A variety of modes of delivery and formats were used. The effectiveness of the courses varied and participant responses ranged from, "The instructor is an enthusiastic and polished professor," to "This was the most frustrating and least worthwhile course I've ever taken...I can't believe such an absurdity as this course took place," and "This was the last in a long line of insults in the name of courses delivered by university faculty in Greenville." Five of the seven courses were responded to favorably and two very negatively. Positive comments were similar to those made in response to courses offered the first year of the Project. The following specific negative characteristics were cited:

"- He had a syllabus but kept changing his mind."
"- Assignments changed daily."
"- He couldn't speak on a level that students could relate to. The course should have been a foreign language requirement!"
"- It seemed he was pulling little exercises for us to do off the top of his head. He never admitted he was not prepared."
"- The class wouldn't get underway for 45 minutes - then a break to discuss logistics, then just before the class was over would get on task and keep us late."
"- One series of classes were spent simply reading our papers we had written. Mine was 16 pages long and took 45 minutes to read!"
"- The instructor gave assignments which he later forgot about and in some cases students received "A" grades without having completed the assignments."
"- The lack of feedback to accompany the assignments was grossly inappropriate."
"- He was namby-pamby. You could talk him into letting us change anything we wanted. He wanted to please. I don't think he's capable of structuring anything."
"- He was so flexible, we could have gotten away with anything."
"- There was no subject matter."
"- We didn't have to do anything. No assistance was received, no assigned readings. Didn't seem like a graduate course."
"- We were given two books, but they didn't apply to what I was doing."
"- I felt I was on my own - too little contact with professor."
"- Expectations were absurdly exacting."

The contents speak for themselves.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services-In-Service Component-Year #2 (continued)

Intern assistance in classrooms continued to be repeatedly and highly praised by teachers throughout the Project. Most SAD #2 personnel who took advantage of the opportunity to attend conferences out of Greenville found the conferences very useful and the opportunity to travel to meet new people and share ideas and materials very enjoyable. As one teacher stated, "It provided much needed time to get out, away from the isolation here in Greenville."

The Rural Education Conference was well organized and planned and ran smoothly. All but one of the 18 school personnel who attended spoke very highly about it. (One person attended a session which he felt wasn't practical, was too theoretical.) Many identified the conference as one of the greatest accomplishments of the Project.

MASTER OF EDUCATION PROGRAM:

The intent of the Teacher Corps was to design and deliver a "field-based, needs responsive" M.Ed. program for Greenville teachers. In reality, the graduate program at USM was simply transferred to Greenville. Requirements for both teachers and interns were identical. Credits were equated only with courses, with the exception of the L.D. practicum and Summer Institute. The resulting program was primarily responsive to program needs and realities, rather than teacher needs and realities. The area of concentration was limited to exceptionality and few choices were available to teachers. The program was field-based in that it was taught in Greenville. It was needs responsive, however, only to the extent that individual professors were.

A variety of course formats and alternatives to the traditional 3 credit, 12 week courses were offered in Greenville. Attempts were made by many professors to relate the content of the courses to the practical world of teachers, although with widely varying degrees of success. Many required papers of projects related to a concern or real need of the teachers. Only two courses were clearly identified as lecture courses. The formats for delivery included, in addition to traditional lecture, minicourses consisting of a mixture of readings, discussion, application in the field and follow-up feedback; a practicum consisting of projects in the field; visitations and discussion; and regular 3 credit courses consisting of lectures, discussions and field work. Courses were scheduled in a variety of time blocks including weekly three hour sessions, five-two day-five hour sessions, four day-three hour sessions, plus four follow-up visits. Some were offered on weekends, others on weekday afternoons and, or evenings, and one on Friday afternoons.

The quality of courses (as perceived by participants) varied. Seven of 14 graduate courses (including the minis) were responded to favorably, three were mixed and four negative. (Refer to courses for more detailed information.) All of those courses responded to positively were directly related to the needs and work of teachers. Friday afternoons was the only time considered definitely inappropriate by most teachers.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services-In-Service Component-Year #2 (continued)

MASTER OF EDUCATION PROGRAM - continued:

At the close of the Project the overall reaction of teachers enrolled in the M.Ed. program was less than favorable (although admittedly colored by the poor handling of the comprehensive exams, discussed below.) Four of the five commented on how easy it was. As one teacher said, "It was kind of lark, none of the courses were rigorous." We could talk the professors into letting us change what we wanted." Another commented that she was disappointed that she didn't feel she knew as much as she should. She also sarcastically added: "The academic work has been busy work. The things that have been rigorous have been the administrative trivia!" One teacher stated that she generally felt o.k. about the program.

The quality of the program may have been questionned, but the quantity certainly was not. Although getting off to a slow start, a total of 14 courses equaling 36 credits were offered over 18 months, between January 1978 and June 1979. As many as three courses were delivered simultaneously. The quantity led to problems. It is difficult to take even one course when teaching full time, much less three. The quality appeared to suffer.

The sequence of courses was also cited as a concern by several teachers, specifically of "Analysis of Teaching" and "Research and the Teacher." "Analysis" required research and yet the "Research" course was given after the "Analysis" course.

All teachers in the M.Ed. program expressed strong feelings about the comprehensive exam and the sloppy manner in which they had been handled, particularly one exam question. The numerous specific examples cited, included the following:

- Early insistence on oral exams when a need for orals was not presented,
- Informing several teachers who had passed the exam prior to notification of all teachers. This left other to wonder if not being informed meant they had flunked and produced anxiety.
- One of the exam questions was based on papers written earlier by teachers. Some teachers didn't receive their papers, with feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses, prior to the exam. Several persons received "A's" on their papers and yet flunked the exam.
- Focus on negatives by one exam evaluator, i.e., comments such as "I wonder how much she really learned in the classes she took" and "I'm generally disappointed in the lack of depth," and yet passing the student.
- Lack of concrete criteria for evaluation of one exam question, including a breakdown of the worth of each criterion.
- Lack of agreement between two evaluators (for same question), one urging students to write philosophically and the other psychologically.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

**Evaluation of Services-In-Service Component-Year #2 (continued)**

MASTER OF EDUCATION PROGRAM - continued

- Lack of concrete feedback from evaluators of one question regarding weaknesses and deficiencies as well as strengths.
- Nebulous comments.
- An evaluator saying to other teachers that one teacher was not of graduate quality.

The second exam question, in contrast to the first, was according to all teachers - handled fairly and honestly. The two evaluators were in agreement about strengths and deficiencies of each paper and reported such information concretely and specifically. Specific criteria for evaluation, including the value of each, were known in advance and used accordingly.

At the close of the M.Ed. program the availability of the program onsite in Greenville was cited by four of five participants as the greatest strength of the program. One person commented that the best thing about the program was most of the professors' sincere interest in the students. In spite of sincere interest, the poor quality of the courses was identified by two teachers as the weakest aspect of the Project. The handling of the comprehensive exams (not the exams themselves - but the handling of the exam) was considered the worst aspect by two other teachers, and taking three courses at one time along with full time teaching by a fifth teacher. As she said, "finding time to do it was the hardest. I'm sure that teaching and planning time dropped." One teacher also commented on the disadvantage of not having the core courses earlier. (They were offered at the end rather than the start of the program.) All of the teachers were appreciative of the assistance and support provided by the Teacher Corps field-based instructor.

**Summary of Services Delivered In-service Component Year #2**

The second year of the Project SAD #2 controlled the curriculum development efforts, supported by the Teacher Corps; the exceptionality program continued to respond to stated needs; the mini-course project inched along with valuable results; efforts to establish a L.S.D.P was finally attended to in the spring; and greater attempts were made to deliver courses which were field based and needs responsive; and the M.Ed. program was completed. In total:

- 13 consultants from five institutions delivered services in Greenville, in addition to
- 15 persons representing 11 organizations who made presentations at the Rural Education Conference,
- Six graduate courses, totalling 18 credits, and one undergraduate course were offered in Greenville,
- 18 of 44 SAD #2 faculty enrolled in one or more courses,
- Four teachers were awarded an M.Ed.

C. DESIGN, DELIVER AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

**Summary of Services Delivered Inservice Component Year #2 (Continued)**

MASTER OF EDUCATION PROGRAM - continued

- 17 SAD #2 faculty attended 14 conferences out of Greenville,
- Six University of Maine faculty attended seven conferences,
- Of seven courses offered, five were responded to favorably and two negatively.

**2. Community Component**

Services provided by the Teacher Corps Project for the community of Greenville are described below:

**Year #1**

| | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Designs/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | September 1977-June 1979 | Community Education Building | | Greenville Community | Located in the center of Greenville, the building served as a central office of the Community Coordinator and was also used for meetings, courses, tutorials, etc. |
| b. | Fall/ Spring 1977-1978 | Community Needs Assessment and Volunteer Training | Teacher Corps<br>-Community Coordinator<br>-P.D.S.<br>-2 interns<br>-12 community persons<br>-5 teachers | Greenville Community | The needs assessment was "intended to find out some of the feelings people have about their own lives, the town they live in and their school...It was also intended, perhaps more importantly, to establish the beginnings of dialogue between the community and the school." An interview schedule was designed by the Community Coordinator, the P.D.S. and an intern and volunteers were trained to conduct the needs assessment. 12 community persons, five teachers and two interns were involved.<br><br>The survey served as a means of involving community persons as well as reaching out to the community and assessing needs. This process was viewed as being of equal importance as the data collected. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| 2. Community Component (continued) | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | It was also time consuming and took longer than anticipated to complete it. It was not completed until spring 1978. By this time a third of Greenville households were surveyed, providing a rich source of demographic information. However, the data was not compiled and reported until spring 1979, although the data was used by the town manager and the board of selectmen. |
| c. | Fall 1977 | Volunteer program in schools | Teacher Corps Community Coordinator | Greenville community/ teachers | A program was started in the fall, identifying teachers interested in volunteers and community persons interested in volunteering. The program was not followed through, however, according to one community person) due to lack of interest, commitment and direction from both school and community persons. |
| d. | Fall 1977 | Literacy Volunteer Program | Community Coordinator | 7 volunteers | An informal literacy assessment was conducted that indicated that literacy volunteers were needed in the community. Seven volunteers were trained in a one-week workshop on how to use techniques of teaching adults to read. |
| | July 1978 | Literacy Training (1 week) | Literacy Volunteers in Maine, Inc. | 7 volunteers | |
| e. | Sept. 1,1977 Nov.1 1977 & March 15,1978 | Teacher Corps News-letters | T.C. Community Coordinator | | Sent to approximately 1,000 parents, superintendents and teachers. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

2. Community Component (continued)

Community workshops covered a wide variety of topics and were open to any interested persons. The Community Education Committee provided input in the determination of what was offered. Many workshops were given because a topic was of particular interest to someone, either giver or taker. Courses were also designed in response to local persons' needs.

f. Workshops and Courses

| Date | Service | persons delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Winter 1978 | "Developmental Psychology" 3 under-graduate credits | 1 UMF staff assisted by T.C. Field-based instructor | 14 community persons, 1 elementary teacher, 3 interns | Delivered on site. Teacher Corps staff person served as assistant and provided follow-up discussion and help as needed. |
| Feb.12 1978 | Workshop "Loneliness" | 1 UMF staff (Education) | 5 community persons | |
| Feb.17 1978 | Workshop: The Whole Person: A Philosophy of Phys.Ed. | 1 UMF staff (Phys.Ed.) | 5 community persons | |
| Feb.27 1978 | Workshop: "Parent-Power as support System for Education | 1 Hartford Teacher Corps Project | 32 community persons | |
| March 10, 1978 | Workshop: "New Enterprises" | 2 UMF staff (Economics) | 7 community persons | |
| March 24, 1978 | Workshop: "Health Activation | 2 UMF staff (Health Ed.) | 5 community persons | |
| May 5/6 | Workshop: Decision-Making Skills | 1 UMF staff (Div.Public Services) | 18 participants | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Persons Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| f. Workshops and Courses (continued) | May 30 | Math | 1 UMF | 4 participants | A series of workshops on how children learn were offered. |
| | June 1 | How Children Learn | 1 UMF | 7 participants | |
| | June 6 | Childrens' Literature | 1 UMF | 6 participants | |
| | June 8 | Tests and Grading | 1 Teacher Corps | 0 participants | |
| | Summer 1978 | "Interpersonal Communication 3 undergrad. credits | 1 UMF | 10 participants | |
| | Summer 1978 | IRE(Institute of Responsive Education) | IRE consultant | Community Coordinator | Planning Skills Workshop - two day workshop to assist in the development of planning skills |
| g. Conferences | | | Location | | |
| | August 1977 | National Teacher Training Conf. | Washington, D.C. | T.C. Community Coordinator 2 community persons | |
| | August 1977 | Network T.C. Conf. | Hyannis,MA. | Community Coordinator | |
| | October 1977 | New England T.C.Network Community Ed. | Norwich, Conn. | Community Coordinator 1 community person | |
| | February 1978 | Community Education Conf. | Wash.,D.C. | Community Coordinator 1 community person | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

g. Conferences (continued)

| Date | Service | Location | Participants |
|---|---|---|---|
| April, 1978 | Health Conference | UMF | Community Coordinator-1 community person |
| May, 1978 | Network Conference | Newton, MA. | Community Coordinator-1 community person |
| August 1978 | National Teacher Corps Conference | Washington, D.C. | Community Coordinator |

h. Intern Assistance Year #1

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1977 | Adult Ed. U.S.History class | 1 intern | 7 community | A course as part of the high school diploma completion program. |
| Fall 1977 | Community needs Assessment | 2 interns Com.Coord. P.D.S. | | A comprehensive assessment using personal interviews |
| Spring 1978 | Community Oral History | 2 interns | | A school/community project interviewing various citizens about the history and industry of Greenville. |
| Spring 1978 | Natural Foods Exhibition | 2 interns | | Designed to acquaint community members with natural food, diets and cooking. |
| Fall 1977 | Making Changes Adult Ed. | 1 intern | 5 community | A course offered in Adult Ed. to help women understand and cope with various life changes and decision-making. |
| Fall/ Spring 1977-78 | Single Parent Organization | 1 intern | 10-12 community | Planned as an opportunity for single parents to come together for support, encouragement. Various short programs using regional resources were planned. |

YEAR #2

a. Formation of School/Community Council

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nov. 1978 | Statement about community involvement written | T.C.Com.Coord. & Principal | | As the termination of the Project grew closer, discussions about possibilities of continuing the P.S.C. resurfaced. (They had lain dormant since the previous fall.) |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| YEAR #2 | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Formation of School/Community Council (continued) | Jan/May 1979 | P.S.C. Training | Director and Principal | P.S.C. members | The emplacement of an ongoing school-community council was identified by Teacher Corps staff as a major goal in October 1978. The Community Council and SAD #2 principal wrote a statement about community involvement in November and the Director initiated a structured discussion regarding the continuation of a school/community group at the January P.S.C meeting. This was the first of a series of "training" exercises. The purpose of this was to assess and share members views on continuation of the P.S.C. and to bring attention to the need to start thinking about it. Planned follow ups to this session, led by the director and the principal were held at subsequent P.S.C. meetings. Continuation of the P.S.C. or a similar school/community group was also discussed at Community Education Council meetings and in January the principal attended a meeting to explain the need for structure, organization, etc. C.E.C. members were urged to attend P.S.C. meetings. Council members (both C.E.C. and P.S.C.) decided that an ongoing school/community council was needed and desirable and a charter statement written and a School-Community Council formed.<br><br>A policy statement was approved by the school board on May 2 and the first School-Community Council meeting was held on May 21. |
| | | Discussions at C.E.C. meetings | Community Coordinator | C.E.C. members | |
| | May 2 | School-Community policy statement accepted by School Board | Community Coordinator Principal 3 community members | | |
| | | School-Community Charter written | | | |
| | May 21 1979 | First meeting of School-Community Council | | Greenville community | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

a. Formation of School/Community Council (continued)

Design/Outcome - Formation of School-Community Council continued

The purpose of this group is to "actively work to facilitate the involvement of the community in improvement of the quality of and opportunities for education in our schools and to facilitate involvement of the schools in educationally related matters that will improve the quality of and opportunities for life in the community."

b. Community Education Committee

This committee served as the primary advising body of the community component and, as the Project progressed, an implementing body as well. It grew largely through the efforts of the Community Coordinator, involving approximately 25 persons at one time or another. The group appeared to start out pretty ragged, with lots of talk, throwing around of ideas, but little sense of direction, organization or action. By the second year, however, sub-committees continued throughout the remainder of the Project. In the fall of 1978, eight areas of concern were identified: curriculum committees, peer counseling, family planning, durg and alcohol abuse, post secondary education, economic development, health services and day care. Subcommittees, described below, were formed to deal with some of these concerns.

(1) Family Planning Committee

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nov. 1978 | Film: "Young, Single and Pregnant" | Community Coordinator | Community Coordinator 2 community | This group started to help form a policy about family planning. Lively discussions were held at meetings throughout the fall and several seminars given. Two local physicians spoke to the group about teenage sexuality in January and later that month the guidance counselor and T.C. director discussed the school's problems in dealing with the same subject. On February 5 a person from Family Planning in Bangor addressed the group. |
| Jan. 1979 | Seminar-Teenage Sexuality | 2 local physicians | ? | |
| Jan. 1979 | Seminar-Teenage Sexuality | SAD#2 counselor T.C. Director | ? | |
| Feb. 1979 | Seminar-Family Planning | Consultant-Family Planning, Bangor | ? | |
| March 21, 1979 | Meeting-Family Planning Group | | 19 students, teachers, C.E.C., School Board | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) Family Planning Committee (continued) | April 4 | Meeting | | 7 community members<br>1 teacher<br>1 counselor | In March an ad hoc committee on family planning was formed with the counselor as facilitator. Several meetings were held in March and April resulting in a Family Planning Policy for the School Board which was written on May 3 and accepted by the School Board in June. |
| | April 12 | Meeting | | 1 teacher, 1 counselor, 1 school board, 1 community, T.C. Community Coordinator | |
| | | Seminar: Family Planning Dover, Me | | T.C.Community Coordinator | |
| | May 3 | Policy Writing Session | | 1 counselor, 1 T.C. Community Coordinator | |
| (2) Drug and Alcohol Abuse Committee | Fall-Spring 1978-1979 | | | School and 50 community persons | A committee on drug and alcohol abuse was formed as a result of a local mini-crisis when a local person recommended bringing a marijuana sniffing police dog into school. This suggestion evoked strong responses from many town and school people resulting in lively debate, the formation of a committee to study the problem and formulate a policy, a series of meetings and presentations resulting in a policy statement accepted by the School Board in December. |
| | Jan. 1979 | Wrote a $15,000 grant for Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention | Town Mgr. 2 community, 1 school board, Community Coord. | | |
| | May 1979 | Film: "What Did You Take?" | 2 community persons | 45 parents, and children | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (2) Drug and Alcohol Abuse Committee (continued) | May 1979 | Consultant to Drug and Alcohol Committee in Milford | Greenville 1 community person | 20 persons | Several persons continued to deal with issues pertaining to drug and alcohol abuse and formed a sub-committee of the Community Education Council. These persons wrote a $15,000 grant for Drug and Alcohol Abuse prevention which was not funded and served as resources to other communities. Materials were gathered and organized and additional funding sources investigated. |
| (3) Day Care Committee | | | | 7 community persons, 2 interns | This committee was formed as a response to expressed interest from community members. Meetings were held throughout the fall and winter - the American Legion offered the group their facilities rent free. Approximately 20 people expressed interest in an organized day care center. A Teacher Corps intern worked with the group. Lack of leadership and support, however, led to a split group - divided between a day care center and trained home care givers and the group fizzled out by early spring. A day care notebook was compiled. |
| (4) Youth Council | Spring 1979 | | 1 community person | 8 Greenville youth | Approximately 10 Greenville youth were involved in the committee. Several meetings were held in March and a statement of purpose written April 2: "The Greenville Youth Committee is intended to help those people from age 13 to 20 who are not "joiners or are not at present productive in the community." 13 assisted at the Rural Conference in April. The committee, however, (according to the Community Coordinator) "Kind of faded" due to lack of direction and the difficulty of the job. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (5) Curriculum Committees | | | Community Coordinator | 5 community persons | Participation of community persons on the school's curriculum committees was identified in the fall, 1978, as an objective of the community component and a means for linking school and community persons. Beyond identifying persons to sit on the committee, however, active support for such linkage was lacking and linkages did not occur until the spring, at which time community persons became more involved, particularly with science and language arts committees. Members of the Family Planning indicated an interest in working with science committee to design a health education curriculum K-12. |
| c. Workshops/ Courses | Fall 1978 | "English Composition" 3 undergrad. credits | SAD #2 Counselor | 9 participants | Designed to increase writing, reading, oral skills in communication. |
| | Spring 1979 | Career Education Exploration Workshop | Digital Corporation | 20 community persons | Designed as an awareness session to acquaint local citizens with job possibilities in an emerging industry in Maine. |
| | March 1979 | Parent Awareness-The Gifted Student | Consultant N.Y.U. | 6 community persons | Designed to acquaint parents with the needs of gifted children and how school/programs need to respond. |
| | March 1979 | Workshop: "Constructive Argument" | 1 UMF staff (Public Services) | 6 community persons | |
| | Spring 1979 | "Rural Sociology"-3 undergrad.credits | 1 UMA staff | 6 community persons | |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| c. Workshops/ Courses continued | April 1979 | Nutrition Workshop | 1 State Dept. consultant | 6 Greenville cooks | A week long workshop designed to update the skills of the school cafeteria cooks. |
| | May 1979 | "Assertiveness Training" | 1 UMF staff (Public Services) | 6 community persons | A series of three seminars to help citizens deal with bureaucracies, gain self-confidence and participation skills. |
| | May-June 1979 | Seminars: Multicultural Education | 1 UMF staff | 8 community persons<br>1 secondary teacher | A series of five seminars were held, dealing with multicultural education as it applies to an isolated rural community. |
| | Summer 1979 | "Intrapersonal Communications" | SAD #2 counselor & Tri-County Psychologist | 12 participants | This course was in the making for months but due to problems in coordination and identification of an instructor, was not scheduled until June. It was designed to increase group process and decision making skills. |
| d. Other Services | Nov.18, 1978 | "Human Services Fair" | T.C. Director and 1 intern | 300 participants | This Fair was designed to bring human service programs and resources to Greenville. Over 20 community services were represented and approximately 300 visitors utilized services available. This served as part of a T.C. intern's internship in Adult Education. |
| | Fall 1978 | Service and Resource Catalog | T.C. Community Coordinator | Greenville Community | Compiled in response to request from Assistant Principal. Presents an overview of services which might be useful for people of Greenville as well as resource people willing to speak on or demonstrate skills or talents for benefit of students, organizations or interested citizens. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

d. Other Services (Continued)

| Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1978 | Parent Teacher Conference Guide | T.C. Community Coordinator & Assistant Princ. | Greenville parents/teachers | Designed as guide for parents and teachers regarding parent teacher conferences. |
| Dec.-Jan. 1979 | $35,000 Title IV Community Education grant | T.C.Community Coordinator | Greenville community | In addition to time spent researching and writing the grant, the Community Coordinator attended two grantsmanship meetings. Valuable assistance was also provided by several persons at the Division of Public Services, UMF. The grant was completed Jan.5. Funds were not awarded, however. |
| April 6-7, 1979 | Rural Education Conference | T.C.Director | 200 participants from Maine and other N.E.states | The intent of the Conference was to 'initiate a renewed awareness of the value and positive attributes in rural education and small schools." New ideas and programs modeled in rural schools were demonstrated and discussions concerning policy alternatives which can help rural schools initiated. Representatives from a wide variety of groups, organizations in Maine were involved in the planning of the conference and over 20 presentations by 27 persons were made. |
| May 1979 | $1,000 Mott Development Grant | T.C.Director | Greenville community | A state grant for training school community council was written and awarded. |
| Ongoing 1978-1979 | Literacy Program | 7 trained community persons | 6 community persons | Three tutors developed clients or were assigned to clients and worked with them over the year with exciting improvements cited. Some linkages between tutors and a teacher were established. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

d. Other Services (continued)

| Date | Service | person delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Feb.1 1979 | Teacher Corps Newsletter | T.C.Community Coordinator with assistance from Principal | Disseminated to community and school persons | Focused on school news. |

e. Conferences

| Conference | Where | Audience |
|---|---|---|
| Oct. 1978 | "Festival of Children's Literature" | Farmington, ME. | Included one community person |
| Oct. 1978 | School/Community Conference (Network) | Boston, MA. | 2 community 1 T.C.Community Coordinator |
| Dec. 1978 | National Community Ed. Conference | Nashville,Tenn. | T.C.Community Coordinator |
| March 1979 | Multicultural Conference (Network) | Boston, MA. | 1 community person T.C. Community Coordinator |
| March 1979 | STEP training | Bangor,ME. | included Community Coordinator |
| May 1979 | Network Year End Conference | Boston, MA. | included 6 community persons Community Coordinator |
| May 1979 | Multicultural Conference | Boston, MA. | included two community Community Coordinator |

f. Intern Assistance

Interns continued to initiate community activities, some of which became an integral part of their formal graduate program.

| Service | person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall/ Spring 1978-79 | Neighborhood reading group | 1 intern | 10-12 children | An informal, afternoon reading hour at an intern's home. |

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| f. Intern Assistance (continued) | Date | Service | Person Delivering | Audience | Design/Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Spring 1979 | Children's room-public library | 1 intern 5 community | Greenville community | A road race and other fund raising activities were put on to raise money for a children's room in the local public library. |
| | Spring 1979 | Co-Director SAD #2 Adult Education | intern-one T.C. Director | 350 community | Intern took full responsibility for the program development recruitment, counseling and brochure publication of the local adult ed. program. This program offered over 40 courses to 350 adults during the spring semester. |
| | Spring 1979 | Pre-school screening | 1 intern assistant principal, special ed. staff | 34 pre-school children | Intern assisted in a comprehensive pre-school screening process. |
| | Fall/ Spring | Day Care Committee | 2 interns T.C.Community Coordinator | 10 community persons | Interns acted as resource persons for a group of community members interested in implementing a day care facility. |

**Evaluation of Services**

The major thrust of the Community Component as defined by the Community Coordinator - was community education, meaning "education delivered to the base of operations, namely the community." Community education meant community involvement and all services provided were purposefully used as tools for involvement whether a committee, a needs assessment, a conference, or a workshop. Such activities were designed to provide opportunities for people to voice opinions, to become meaningfully involved and to feel more control over their lives - all goals of the community component. For some, involvement did exactly that. Ongoing work on committees (P.S.C. and C.E.C.) proved to be a particularly powerful tool. A limited number of people were deeply and positively affected. (See section on accomplish/impact for more detailed description.) In summary, approximately:

- 25 persons were involved in committees at one time or another with a hard core of 8 to 10.
- 17 community persons (including five teachers) helped conduct the needs assessment.
- 8 persons were involved in the literacy program.
- 142 persons attended workshops and
- 51 attended courses
- 13 community persons attended eight conferences throughout the United States.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of services

The community needs assessment, designed and conducted the first year of the Project, served the purpose of involving persons and also yielded a rich source of demographic information about Greenville. The assessment proved to be too cumbersome and time consuming, however, to serve as a quick, updated assessment of needs and it did not influence the design of services provided by the Teacher Corps.

Some programs/committees - such as the Volunteer Program, Curriculum Committee, Youth Council, Day Care Committee - were not notably productive. This appeared to be due to lack of planning and organization and/or interest and commitment.

Out of state conferences were responded to very favorably by most community persons. The opportunity to meet new people, share information and opinions, and visit new places were cited as being particularly useful.

Increased interaction between school and community was stated as a major Project goal and the formation of a School-Community Council served as primary (and significant) evidence of achievement of linkages. Linkages were slow in coming, however, and were not viewed as a priority in the community component of the Project. Few planned programs promoting interaction between school and community persons were designed and/or implemented. As stated in the Year #II Proposal, "We have not spent enough time designing a more viable strategy of getting the community into the school. We need to work more closely with the school administrators on this issue." The following statement was also made; "Nor are the members of the Community Education Council 'interphasing' with school personnel as such, partly because it is so much more pleasant to deal with those community matters which we are all familiar with." Interaction increased the second year, primarily through committees and off shoots of some activities.

Data from evaluation of workshops is spotty due to limited returns, particularly the first year, and the questionnaire formats used. Many were forced choice items which yielded little descriptive information regarding specific aspects of courses which were useful or not useful, etc. Data that was collected, however, indicates that most workshops were fairly well received. Some were very well attended, with a high of 32 in the "Parent Power" Workshop, 20 in the 'Career Education' workshop and 18 in the "Decision Making workshop. Others were not attended at all, as the workshop on "Grading and Testing." These figures served as indicators of community interest and need. Community persons appeared to be less interested in school matters, such as "learning, and more responsive to topics dealing with self-improvement, basic skills and control over one's life.

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services

Courses offered for community persons were designed in response to local persons needs and three of four were generally responded to favorably. Community persons appeared to be appreciative of the availability of courses regardless of how much or little they liked them. The following comments were made about one course which was well received:

"I had never taken a college course before and I feel that everything that I expected it to be it was! The material was difficult at first, as anything new is, but I feel I have benefited from everything that occurred during this course."

"The most obvious strengths were the careful preparation of the instructor, the dedication he exhibited, and his enthusiasm with the material he was presenting."

"The class time was very well organized, the professor presented the material, time for discussion was allowed, visual aids were used as backups at times. The discussion group was held during the week, before the next class also gave extra help to further review the material - study sheets were also helpful!"

"(1) excellent lectures, (2) a lot of handouts, (3) freedom to ask questions anytime."

"Meeting to talk with the instructor - he was willing to help with materials we wanted for extra reference. Good books on reserve!"

"The instructor was very happy to answer questions and re-explain any topic being discussed."

"The opportunities for student participation were enjoyable and very helpful. The team teaching was well coordinated and enabled us to always be in touch... The many written requirements kept me on top of this course at all times.?

"Stimulation to think points out. The questions assigned were excellent. They encouraged thought without pressure of right and wrong."

"The observations help make my note taking a lot more meaningful. I understand what I'm looking for and why I'm doing it."

"I am in agreement with his insistence that meaningful learning does not happen by rote and appreciate his encouraged class participants to build their knowledge by concepts. Also - I really like his scheduling two free non-class days to meet with students in Greenville."

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

Evaluation of Services

This course was carefully planned, taking into account the extent of diversity within the class (from a student who hadn't any background in psychology and hadn't been in the classroom for over 30 years, to a graduate student who recently graduated from Harvard) and the need to allay student anxiety and fear of failure, which is particularly acute for students who have been out of the academic sphere for a long time. It was structured and yet open-ended enough to allow for student differences and to meet differing needs. As the instructor noted, "The student population provided a special flavor and necessitated a very idiosyncratic approach to instruction." He wrote an analysis of the specific and planned characteristics of his course that were designed to minimize anxiety and maximize learning and which contributed to its success. This paper was printed in the June, 1978 issue of the New England Teacher Corps Exchange.

Other positive comments about courses and workshops included the following:

"I was enlightened by other's opinions."
"Open discussion of items."
"The instructor was approachable and used our language."
"The instructor talks on our level, doesn't use long words."
"The atmosphere was very relaxing (vs. classroom atmosphere.) I felt I was really able to share my feelings and picked up many good ideas."
"Relaxed facilities, in the community education building and superintendent's office."
"He listens to you."
"He knows his subject and is enthusiastic about teaching it."
"A great speaker."
"The instructor tried to appreciate all answers, thus making everyone feel they are contributing."

Negative responses to courses and workshops were also expressed:

"The afternoon should have been less intellectual and more hands on."
"He was a monotonous, sleepy, tight talking person."
"Some discussion on tangents, although interesting, sometimes reminded me of the hours of work waiting for me at home."
"The program didn't pertain enough to our schools."
"Lecture sessions were too long."
"I will get three easy credits."
"Not enough time."
"Spends time with whom he likes."

C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES - continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Evaluation of Services (continued) | Negative responses to courses and workshops - continued<br><br>"He goes right around in circles."<br>"He knows what he is saying but is always too busy asking if it is o.k. with everyone. I don't think he should be on the college level with so little self-confidence."<br>"He bulshitted too much of subject things."<br>"Need more on the job training."<br>"Lack of elementary or junior high school faculty to contribute other teachers points of view."<br>"I was led to believe it would be individualized to personal desires. (It wasn't.)"<br><br>The Human Services Fair and Rural Education Conference were not formally evaluated. Both services, however, were carefully planned and ran smoothly and were responded to favorably by many persons who chose to participate. Approximately 500 persons attended the two conferences. |
| d. Summary of Services Delivered Through the Community Component of the Teacher Corps Project | The first six months of the community component of the Teacher Corps Project were devoted primarily to the needs assessment and setting up the community office and the Community Education Committee. Over the next six months, services - primarily workshops and courses- were delivered and linkages with UMF began. Linkages between school and community were limited. The second year of the Project, the community component became more focused, largely through the subcommittees of the C.E.C., and the involvement of a small group of deeply committed community persons, intensified and interaction between school and community people increased, resulting to date:<br><br>- 22 persons from 10 different organizations/institutions outside Greenville delivered services to community people in Greenville, in addition to<br>- 15 persons representing 11 organizations who made presentations at the Rural Education Conference.<br>- 1[illegible] professors from UMF in seven departments (including two Deans) delivered services in Greenville.<br>- 18 isolated workshops/seminars and four series of seminars/workshops were delivered in Greenville.<br>- Four three credit undergraduate courses were delivered in Greenville.<br>- Three grants totalling $51,000 were written (one was funded.)<br>- Eight conferences throughout the country were attended by 13 community persons in addition to 10 conferences attended by the community coordinator.<br>- A comprehensive town assessment was conducted and reported.<br>- A School-Community Council was emplaced.<br>- Seven Greenville persons were trained as literacy trainers.<br>- A family planning policy and a school-community policy were adopted by the school board. |

(C. DESIGN, DELIVERY AND EVALUATION OF SERVICES)

3. Pre-service Component

Four interns with liberal arts college degrees and a backlog of diverse experiences both related and unrelated to education, spent two years in Greenville, as Teacher Corps interns. The four represented the cream of over 125 applicants for the positions and were a fiesty, articulate and independent group of individuals. The interns entered the program under the impression that they could concentrate in an area of their choice and only after admission were informed that the expected and available concentration was exceptionality. Even this wasn't clear, however. As stated earlier, negotiations between the Teacher Corps, UMF and USM were slow and unclear and conflicting reports were heard as late as January, 1978.

Through sustained pushing and voicing of concerns by the Team Leader, the Director, and the interns, a concentration in adult education was negotiated for one intern, with a minor in secondary social studies. The other three interns concentrated in exceptionality and certified in elementary education. The proposed programs were to be "job-embedded, problem focused and site specific." In reality, the USM Master of Education program was simply transferred to Greenville. Program requirements for the interns were identical to those for Greenville teachers which were identical to those for teachers at USM; with the exception of several courses out of Greenville in which the interns chose to participate, teachers and interns participated in the same courses.

The M.Ed. program consisted of course requirements and with the exception of a three credit practicum in L.D. and a six credit internship in adult education, field experiences were not built into the requirements. Course requirements for the M.Ed. included three core courses, 18 credits in the field of concentration and two elective courses. Choices were minimal and with the exception of the internship and the practicum, credit was equated only with course work and of the 14 graduate courses offered, only the practicum was purposefully designed as a field experience. Many experiences considered most valuable by the interns were not related to UMF efforts or expectations and were not given credit.

In addition to requirements for the M.Ed. program, all interns were required to fulfill undergraduate requirements for certification which included 12 credits in methods and six in student teaching. This represented a compromise from an even heavier load required of undergraduates at UMF and was the result of months of negotiation. These undergraduate requirements were not identified until the spring of 1978, at which time four methods courses were scheduled in Greenville, on top of graduate courses. The interns were thus loaded the first year of the Project with course requirements, with some of them taking up to 21 credits at one time during a single semester. Most of the interns

3. Pre-service Component - continued

completed approximately 3/4 of the total requirements in a nine month span between December 1977 and August 1978.

The second year of the Project two of the three interns majoring in exceptionality also completed course requirements for certification in learning disabilities, through UMO. As the interns became more focused regarding their own career goals, they also took a more active role in seeking courses they needed and wanted outside of Greenville and UMF if necessary.

A review of courses taken by the interns is presented below:

INTERN #1 - Summer 1977 - C.M.T.I.
Fall 1977 - Edu 503-Analysis of Teaching
Edu 550-Research
Spring 1978
Edr 200 Elementary Reading Methods
Edr 232 Teaching Social Studies
Edr 204 Science Education
Edr 231 Teaching Math in Elem.School
Eduw 540 Workshop Task Analysis
Eduw 541 Workshop Remediation of Learning Difficulties
Eduw 542 Workshop Management of Disruptive Behavior
Ed Py 582 Psychology of Measurement and Evaluation
Summer 1978
Reading-Reaching Every Child(Wheelock)
Edu 504 Curriculum Development
Edu 513 Reading Remediation
Fall 1978
Edu 512 Foundation of Elem.Reading
Edu 505 Preparation of Classroom Material
Spring 1979 - Edu 500 Philosophy
ST200-1 Student Teaching
Edu 541 Practicum in Exceptionality



INTERN #2

Summer 1977 - C.M.T.I.
Fall 1977 Edu 503 Analysis of Teaching
Edu 550 Research
Spring 1978
Edr 200 Elem. Reading Methods
Edr 262 Secondary Social Studies
Ed Py 582 Psychological Measurement and Evaluation
Edu 543 Education of the Exceptional Child
Summer 1978 Edu 527 Intro.to Adult Education
Edua 529 Curriculum Construction for Adults
Fall 1978 Edua 540 Internship in Adult Ed.
Spring 1979 Edua 558 Psychology of Adult Learning
ST200-8 Student Teaching
Edu 500 Philosophy and the Teacher

INTERN #3

Summer 1977 CMTI
Fall 1977 Edu 503 Analysis of Teaching
Edu 550 Research
Py 225 Developmental Psychology
Spring 1978 Edr 200 Elementary Reading Methods
Edr 232 Teaching Social Studies
Edr 204 Science Education
Edr 231 Teaching Math in Elem.School
Eduw 540 Workshop Task Analysis
Eduw 541 Workshop remediation of L.D.
Eduw 542 Workshop Management of Disruptive Behavior
Ed Py 582 Psychological Measurement and Evaluation
Edu 543 Education of the Exceptional Child
Fall 1978 ST200-1 Student Teaching
Edu 512 Foundation of Elem.Reading
Spring 1979 Edu 500 Philosophy and the Teacher
Edm 234 Learning Disability Methods
Py 321 Indiv.Psychological Testing
Edu 541 Practicum in Exceptionality

3. Pre-service Component - continued

INTERN #4

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Summer 1977 | C.M.T.I. | |
| Fall 1977 | Edu 503 | Analysis of Teaching |
| | Edu 550 | Research |
| Spring 1978 | Edr 200 | Elementary Reading Methods |
| | Edr 232 | Teaching Social Studies |
| | Edr 204 | Science Education |
| | Edr 231 | Teaching Math in Elem.School |
| | Eduw 540 | Workshop Task Analysis |
| | Eduw 541 | Workshop Remediating of Learning Disabilities |
| | Ed Py 582 | Psychology of Measurement & Evaluation |
| | Edu 543 | Education of the Exceptional Child |
| Summer 1978 | Edu 575 | Foundations of Early Childhood |
| | Ed Py 562 | Group Process |
| | Edu 513 | Reading Remediation |
| Fall 1978 | ST200-1 | Student Teaching |
| | Edm 233 | Learning Disabilities |
| Spring 1979 | Edu 500 | Philosophy & the Teacher |
| | Edm 234 | Learning Disabilities Methods |
| | Py 321 | Indiv.Psych.Testing |
| | Ed 541 | Practicum in Exceptionality |

Completion of the Masters of Education program required successful completion of a comprehensive exam (described in M.Ed. program, Inservice Component,) consiting of two questions covering the core courses and area of exceptionality. All interns took the exam in April, 1979. Two failed one or both sections of the exam and took a second exam. All interns were awarded M.Ed. degrees in June,1979.

Field Experiences

In addition to course requirements, all of the interns ctively involved themselves in a wide variety of activities in the schools throughout the Project (see Chart A) and provided assistance to close to half of Geeenville teachers. These experiences were initiated and shaped by the interns. Some of them were related to course work although many, if not most, were not. Throughout the Project experiences working directly in the schools were cited by all interns as being particularly valuable and useful to them.

Community involvement is expected of all interns participating in Teacher Corps Projects. Greenville interns were expected to spend 40% of their time in community activities and all were actively involved with the community throughout the Project, although no program plan for intern involvement in community activities was designed. Intern experiences in the community were largely self-initiated and self designed and included teaching adult education courses, assisting with the community needs assessment, and co-designing and directing a local Human Services Fair. Intern field experiences, both school and community, are reviewed in detail in Chart A which follows on the following pages.

CHART A

INTERN #1

| Elementary Classroom Work | Secondary Classroom Work | Special Areas/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1977<br>- Reviewed types of individual testing re: Dolice Vocabulary, Diagnostic & Peabody<br>- Observation of PEBO-4th grade<br>- Gave preview museum presentation to kindergarten class and 2nd grade<br>- 1st grade small group work with students in reading and math (2 months)<br>- 2nd grade observation<br>- 3rd grade observation<br>- 4th & 5th grade observation (2 weeks)<br>- Observed special education reading group<br>- 6th grade observation - social studies<br>- "New Games" intermural with grades 4,5, & 6 | -Met with Home Economics teacher to discuss "Life styles" panel in health class<br>-Observation of industrial arts classes<br>-Participated in Career Night at the high school<br>-Junior High tutoring-reading<br>-Administered and recorded results of index Academic Responsibility for junior and senior high students | -Co-organized and participated in Natural Foods luncheon for staff and community<br>-Taught "Making Changes" in Adult Education classes<br>-Prepared materials for fall parent/teacher conferences<br>-PSC representative | -Worked on self-evaluation K-8 materials<br>-Attended elementary staff meetings and monthly teacher meetings<br>-Attended junior high staff meetings<br>-Attended senior high inservice planning meeting<br>-Participated in the language arts curriculum committee work<br>-Teacher/Workshop presenter elem. math curriculum<br>-Reported on elem. happenings for T.C.Newsletter |
| Spring 1978<br>-Continued work with 1st grade in math & reading<br>-Graphed math goals for 1st grade | -Assisted home economics teacher re: marriage class<br>-Reviewed math books - junior high<br>-Tutored individuals in junior high reading program | -Worked with special ed. class-math lesson<br>-Wrote outline and content for field trip booklet<br>-Helped community needs assessment | -Judged Winter Carnival<br>-Participated in Gifted/ Talented Workshop<br>-Participated in K-8 self-evaluation workshop<br>-Secretary for Art Committee<br>-Participated in PET mtg. for 1st grade<br>-Judged school parade floats and costumes<br>-Assisted elem.staff with spring concert and art show |

INTERN #1 - continued

| Elementary Classroom Work | Secondary Classroom Work | Special Areas/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1978<br>-Worked in 4th grade(Sept.-Dec.) in all areas of instruction. Classroom responsibilities included one reading group<br>-Worked with Data Bank in social studies<br>-Did a science unit on trees that included presentations by community members and a papermaking trial<br>-Taught math for one month | | -Developed after school neighborhood reading groups | -Participated in the work of the Curriculum Committee for social studies<br>-Attended a conference for social studies in Boston<br>-Reviewed social studies texts for elementary curriculum<br>-Attended all monthly teacher workshops<br>-Attended elementary staff workshops |
| Spring 1979<br>-Student teaching-Jan./March-Classroom responsibilities: 2 reading groups, data bank,social studies, math-5 weeks. Individual meetings with 5 students re: behavior; whole class activities-3 times a week on friendship, appreciating ourselves & others, listening,resolving conflict.<br>-Developed and taught a unit on a study of the human body with 9-1st & 2nd graders, including films, field trips, discussions,experimental learning activities<br>-Individual meetings daily with one 2nd grader-goal classroom behavior change. | | -Organized fund raising for Children's library | -Participated in the work of the Social Studies Curriculum Committee<br>-Attended elementary staff meetings<br>-Attended monthly teacher workshops |

INTERN #2

| Secondary Classroom Activities | Adult Education Program/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings |
|---|---|---|
| Fall 1977<br>- Planned for teaching a social studies class with high school teacher<br>- Developed tutoring program with high school counselor<br>- Developed for Independent Study in social studies with high school teacher<br>- Co-presented museum material to elementary students<br>- Observed 7th grade social studies classes<br>- Reviewed high school social studies curriculum. | - Taught Adult Education class- U.S. History<br>- Coordinated and wrote proposal for volunteer program for an adult<br>- Assisted in community needs assessment<br>- Coached intramural basketball. | - Attended elementary staff meetings<br>- Attended high school staff meetings<br>- Attended monthly teacher workshops<br>- Chaired Resource Committee in conjunction with elementary self-evaluation<br>- Worked on Natural Foods Luncheon<br>- Assisted in community needs assessment. |
| Spring 1978<br>- Tutored one student-history<br>- Designed with English teacher individualizing instruction project<br>- Distributed I.A.R. material to junior and senior high school teachers<br>- Met with 10 English students in independent study - Jan.-May<br>- Worked on role play in English class<br>- Developed and taught independent study unit for one class - history<br>- Assisted in the development of "Foxfire" book with high school English students. | - Taught Adult Education class - U.S. History<br>- Assisted in Public Service Resource Catalog. | -Attended Social Studies Curriculum meetings and actively participated in the work of the committee<br>-Attended high school staff meetings<br>-Attended monthly teacher workshops<br>-Attended Northeast Conference for the Social Studies - Boston<br>-Judged school fair contest<br>-Assisted high school track coach. |

INTERN #2 - continued

| Secondary Classroom Activities | Adult Education Program/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings |
|---|---|---|
| Fall 1978<br>-Co-organizer, instructor and evaluator for term paper unit taught in college junior English class<br>-Traveled to University of Maine with English students to use library resources for term paper<br>-Edited and transcribed "Foxfire" material. | -Instructor "Current Issues in the Social Studies" for Adult Education<br>-Coordinator and developer of the Human Services Fair<br>-Attended Adult Education Director's meetings<br>-Participated in personnel and advertisement for Adult Education program. | -Participated in Social Studies curriculum work<br>-Attended all monthly teachers' meetings<br>-Attended high school staff meetings<br>-Conducted (10 hours) interviews for "Foxfire" book<br>-Did public relations work with the community for "Foxfire" book. |
| Spring 1979<br>-Student teaching 8 weeks in high school social studies<br>-Continued involvement in social studies classes-taught unit on the Great Depression<br>-Supervised field trip with social studies class to State Capitol-Augusta<br>-Coached intermural volleyball and girls' track team. | -Co-director of Adult Education program<br>-Organizer, program developer and personnel recruiter for Adult Education program<br>-Developed Adult Education brochure<br>-Co-presenter in workshop for Dexter, Maine, Advisory Council on Adult Education<br>-Presenter Tri-county Workshop - Adult Education program. | -Participated in Social Studies Curriculum Committee work<br>-Attended Northeast Conference for the Social Studies - Boston<br>-Attended monthly teacher workshops<br>-Attended high school staff meetings<br>-Reviewed Social Studies programs for K-12 curriculum<br>-Presenter at Conference on Rural Education - moderator - member of panel discussion. |

INTERN # 3

| Elementary Classroom Work | Secondary Classroom Work | Special Areas/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1977<br>-Gave PEBO presentation- 4th grade<br>-Observations of grades 3, 4, 7<br>-Previewed of presentation of museum materials for grades 3, 4, 8<br>-Small group work with 4th grade social studies<br>-Reviewed elementary spelling texts<br>-Tutorial work with junior high spelling<br>-Puppet show planning session<br>-Tutorial session with one junior high student<br>-Developed personalized reading program. | -Planning with home economics teacher on Natural Foods luncheon<br>-Participated in small group work session with English and reading 7-12<br>-Plan with 9th and 10th grades to organize student activities (4 months). | -Coached little kids intermural sports<br>-Reflections on classroom experiences for newsletter<br>-Conference with John Moran State Dept.of Education, Rehabilitational Vocational Education<br>-Chairperson - Food Co-op<br>-Helped in the design of community needs assessment. | -Attended elementary staff meetings and monthly teacher workshops<br>-K-8 self-evaluation curriculum meetings. |
| Spring 1978<br>-Observed 5th grade science program<br>-Ran small group classes using team teaching model in math and science in 5th grade for 7 months<br>-Small group reading in 5th grade for 3 months<br>-Coordinated and produced puppet show with 4th grade students. | -Independent study with high school English class<br>-Film course with high school English class<br>-Tutorial program in spelling in junior high<br>-Tutorial program in English in high school<br>-Coordinated and produced "Foxfire" type booklet on the Moosehead area with High School English class. | -Judged elementary spring parade contest<br>-Oral history project | -Language Arts Curriculum Committee member<br>-Attended junior high staff meetings<br>-Attended monthly teacher meetings and elementary staff meetings<br>-Attended staff meeting conference with principal and high school staff<br>-Conference with high school English teacher re: Film Course. |

INTERN #3 - continued

| Elementary Classroom Work | Secondary Classroom Work | Special Areas/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1978<br>-Student teaching eight weeks in multi-level K-4 classroom in Shirley, ME.<br>-Primary responsibilities included reading and science tutorial work with individual students in all content areas<br>-Supervising and participating in team sports in Shirley School. | -Tutorial work in junior high science and reading<br>-Working with small groups in junior high reading<br>-Completed "Foxfire" book, printing and binding. | -Coordinating distribution of "Foxfire" books with students<br>-Assisted teacher in nursery school program two days a week<br>-Resource person for Day Care committee | -Attended monthly teacher meetings<br>-Participated in science curriculum committee work. |
| Spring 1979<br>-Tutorial work with a student in Shirley - reading<br>-Gave demonstration lessons using ESS materials for elementary classes (complete unit - 10 lessons)<br>-Gave battery of IQ and diagnostic tests to elementary and junior high students<br>-Pond unit with Shirley School students. | -Working with small groups in reading - junior high<br>-Tutorial work with junior high student - reading and science. | -Job shadowing with Tri-county Regional Special Education services<br>-Constructed indoor play furniture for nursery school<br>-Provided swings for Shirley School. | -Attended monthly staff committee meetings<br>-Consulting with teachers that referred students for testing. |

INTERN #4

| Elementary Classroom Work | Secondary Classroom Work | Special Areas/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings/Community |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1977<br>-Worked with kindergarten teacher<br>-Museum previews K-6<br>-Observing and design in grade 2 Learning Center<br>-Dictionary skills learning center<br>-Helped with Christmas parties | -Worked with high school English teacher on proposal to visit two schools in Boston to preview their curriculum resource materials. | -Prescreening meeting with special education personnel<br>-Process Woodcock/Peabody for students<br>-Diagnostic testing grades 1-12<br>-Flanders observation in elementary classroom<br>-Tutor for special education(Junior and Senior High.) | -Helped with community needs assessment<br>-Attended Tri-county Education meetings<br>-Attended teacher curriculum workshops<br>-Resource person for affective games<br>-Participated in inservice meetings<br>-Attended workshop on individualization<br>-Adult Education tutor. |
| Spring 1978<br>-Taught in kindergarten<br>-Set up math methods lessons with students<br>-Group lesson with 2nd grade using Taba's model<br>-Worked with 2nd grade math class-1 meeting<br>-Designing Language Arts Learning Center with regular 2nd grade teachers and Special Education staff. | -Worked with high school English teacher/ Synetics model<br>-Worked with 9th grade English class<br>-Demonstration of Synetics model-9th grade<br>-Discussion of Dickens with 9th grade<br>-Helped design role play model for 9th grade<br>-Video taped values clarification lesson. | -Worked with remedial math class(special ed.)<br>-Diagnostic testing in elementary school<br>-Gave Key Math in Shirley School and Greenville School. | -Participated in teachers workshops (monthly)<br>-Attended integrating seminar<br>-Attended math workshop<br>-Organized single parent organization<br>-Literacy volunteer training. |

INTERN #4 - continued

| Elementary Classroom Work | Secondary Classroom Work | Special Areas/ Community | Committee Work and Meetings/Community |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1978<br>-Student teaching in 6th grade classroom. Involved with all areas of teaching. Taught a special unit of creative writing. Developed a poetry unit. Product of unit resulted in a course outline and booklet for other teachers to use in their teaching of poetry. A book of student poetry resulted from this unit. | -Coordinated and produced Children's Theater with 10th grade English class. | -Worked with a L.D. class in Guilford, Maine for three weeks<br>-Internship with Tri-county Regional Special Education Services, in Dover-Foxcroft for three weeks. Activities included job shadowing the Tri-county staff and reviewing a variety of tests used by the counseling service. | -Attended all monthly teacher workshops<br>-Participated in fall parent-teacher conferences<br>-Resource person for day care center. |
| Spring 1979<br>-Participated in several follow-up days with the 6th grade. Activities included working with specific students in content areas of study. | -Helped coordinate fund raising activities for the 10th grade raft trip. | -Worked with three elementary L.D. students in Greenville special education program<br>-Assisted in writing IEP's for these students<br>-Gave I.Q. tests and wrote reports for students in the special education program<br>-Made visitations and taught at region L.D. class in Guilford, Maine in four follow-up sessions<br>-Tested children during preschool clinic and assisted with the recommendations for the children screened. | |

Support/Supervision/Evaluation

The primary support system for interns consisted of the Team Leader (I), who provided assistance, materials, organization and encouragement throughout the Project (particularly the first year as Team Leader) and the interns themselves. The first year of the Project the interns were in frequent contact with the Team Leader and each other through regular, weekly team meetings which provided a forum for discussion, exchange of new and old ideas, updating of experiences and expectations and feedback. The second year the interns acted more independently and contact with the new Team Leader, who was also heavily involved in the SAD #2 curriculum effort, was less frequent. Team meetings were not held.

The interns were observed in classrooms when student teaching by the UMF supervisor and also by the Team Leaders, and feedback was given. No observations/feedback regarding community experiences was provided and no formal system of ongoing supervision/evaluation (written and verbal) was established for either school or community experiences. Scheduled conferences with each intern/supervisor(s)/and involved teachers or community persons, to provide an opportunity for sharing of perceptions and evaluation of all involved persons were not held.

Conferences

The Teacher Corps provided the opportunity for interns to participate in conferences held throughout the United States. (See chart on conferences.)



Evaluation/Intern Perspective

Although the interns managed to amass an unusual and valuable set of experiences, the program itself was a disappointment to them. They expected an innovative, organized program designed in response to individual and rural needs. Instead, they received a traditionally designed program which was delivered and coordinated in a piecemeal fashion. They expected a program that was indeed "job embedded, problem focused and site specific." It wasn't. It was site specific only in that courses were taught in Greenville and problem focused only to the extent that individual professors were. Many of the experiences considered most valuable and useful to them were outside program requirements and UMF.

They had high expectations of professors. They expected them to be knowledgeable, well prepared and organized, in addition to being able to involve students and relate the subject matter to their concerns and interests. In short, they expected good teaching and were not hesitant to be vocal about it. They were quick to praise courses that were top notch and impatient and critical of those that were not. They generally responded more critically to courses than teachers and "ruffled some feathers" in doing so. The poor quality of many courses was cited by all interns throughout the Project as a major disappointment. Ironically, most of the best courses they had and those that they considered the most job related and needs responsive were several offered out of Greenville. It doesn't take an on-site course to be "field-based and needs-responsive."

Evaluation/Intern Perspectives - continued

The following comments were made by interns about specific positive characteristics of courses:

. focuses on progression of ideas and issues rather than merely facts
. encourages thinking through careful sequence of questions, uses questioning to raise levels of thinking
. up on latest research and taught us how to find it, made us aware of available resources
. lots of handouts
. obviously a thinker, on top of field, intellectual intensity
. knows his stuff and demands work
. created an atmosphere for people to talk, for self disclosures
. clear expectations, let it be known that she expected people to participate in class
. positive approach, worked from strengths
. brought in speakers relevant to content
. great discussions based on experiences (speakers, readings, etc.) used a variety of media
. provided a syllabus, written and verbal, and presented clear overview of what was going to happen for each class
. assigned readings every night, but no pressure on whether or not to read, if not, had nothing to contribute the next day
. assignments were open ended, allowed us to choose something relevant to us
. was a collector of books, pamphlets, articles, etc., and had articles reproduced for us
. required group presentations
. good lecturer
. role playing, case histories
. provided feedback on papers we wrote
. assignment-30 research articles to read and critique.



And negative characteristics:

. no time line, no objectives, no continuity
. had a syllabus but didn't follow it
. professor was not interested in subject matter
. just information giving, no insights
. poor lecturer
. poor questioning techniques - overly simplistic questions
. too low keyed, not enough direction
. evaluation (copying answers to questions from a book) was an insult to high school students much less graduate students
. assumed I knew things I didn't
. awful lecturer, boring old stuff, information was trivia
. didn't return or review tests
. wanted to be responsive but was lazy
. yes person, promised to do things but didn't follow through
. no content
. assignments never returned
. grades sent in before requirements were met.

The comments speak for themselves.

At the close of the Project the following were cited by interns as the greatest disappointment(s) of the program:

- incompetence on the part of the University and Teacher Corps staff/UMF courses
- community component - lack of support/low quality of courses
- some Teacher Corps staff/University component-low quality of courses
- poor teaching models by college professors- "I'm really worried for those teachers and young kids. If the quality of what I've had is an indication of the quality of teaching then we're in trouble."

Evaluation/Intern Perspective - continued

In spite of the quality of the program and of some courses, the interns managed to amass a very unique set of experiences and learnings and three of four stated at the close of the Project that they would do it again if given the opportunity. One intern wasn't sure. Two years of living in Greenville and participating in services and activities sponsored or delivered by the Teacher Corps provided a rich backlog of experiences and learnings, both practical and theoretical, personal and professional, which was unique and could not be duplicated elsewhere. Although the program requirements were rigidly defined, interns had the time, freedom and the opportunity to shape a wide variety of learning experiences.

The following were cited by interns at the close of the Project as the most valuable aspect(s) of the program:

- Being in the Shirley School/summer at U.S.M./reading at UMF/Boston-Learning Institute
- L.D. practicum ("I set it up for myself-planned it and structured it")
- Mary Pines/student teaching
- working in Adult Education/Dick H./Leon/girls' track/term paper unit with Brad/three weeks at Sebago
- Children's Literature Conference in Boston/IRE in Atlanta/working in classrooms/being on Social Studies Committee

The comments serve as indicators of the diversity of experiences the interns had.

D. ROLE GROUP PERSPECTIVES

In order to truly understand the nature of the UMF/Greenville Teacher Corps Project, it is essential to be aware of the perspectives and perceptions throughout the Project of persons in key role groups affected by the Project, namely UMF faculty and Greenville school and community people. A summary of these perspectives is presented below. Personal interviews served as primary sources of information along with Project documents. IHE faculty were individually interviewed in December 1977, and again in September 1978 and June 1979. School administrators were interviewed in January 1978, September 1978, January 1979 and June 1979. A limited number of school persons, randomly selected were interviewed in January 1978 and in September 1978. All school faculty were interviewed at the close of the Project in June 1979.

1. GREENVILLE - COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #I

A limited number of community persons were randomly selected and interviewed in January 1978, September 1978 and June 1979. The alliance between the Teacher Corps Project and the people of Greenville was an uneasy one. To start, the Project staff, by the nature of their status as team members of a Federal Project, were viewed as aliens, regardless of the fact that three of them had lived in Greenville from eight years to a lifetime. One local person commented that some people view the Project staff as "out of townies who do crazy things and have easy jobs." Building trust takes time and community acceptance was slow. Some members of the community were apathetic and either thought things are fine the way they were or were just sitting back waiting to see what would come out of it. Some simply weren't interested in education and felt it was the teachers' problem, not theirs. Other people were impatient, wanting to

D. ROLE GROUP PERSPECTIVES - continued
GREENVILLE - COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVE

see immediate and tangible results. Many were frustrated with the developmental nature of the Project. They understood Teacher Corps money buying "products," but not money buying "process." They wanted to be responded to quickly and visibly. Some people were offended by the amount and manner of Teacher Corps money spent, as indicated by the following comments printed in the November 1977 Teacher Corps Newlsetter:

- Why should the taxpayers finance a paid vacation to San Diego for Keenan and company?
- Why should taxpayers pay for furthering a teacher's education? They can well afford to pay for their own masters degree.
- Why should taxpayers pay for shooting the breeze with Ms. Poulson over a cup of coffee? at -four bucks, who is paying for the coffee?
- The Teacher Corps is a G-D-RIP-OFF sponsored by politicians eager for votes and educators hungry for money.

In addition, many community people were suspicious of federal programs, having been "burned" before. According to one local person, "You have not only apathy, you have bitterness and hostility to anything federal and it is all basically due to that white elephant, the sewer system." Others viewed the Project as a federal giveaway. Such was the environment the Project staff entered, charged with the responsibility of linking the community and school and UMF.

Additional problems and concerns related to the Teacher Corps Project were voiced by community persons throughout the first year. Communication was repeatedly cited as a major trouble spot. All community persons interviewed in January 1978 identified it as the major weakness of the Project and many local persons commented in September that it continued to be a problem. Cries for clear statements about what the Project was, what was happening in the Project and who was responsible were heard continually. Roles, responsibilities and Project goals were never clear. Many people felt that information either wasn't relayed, or else if it was, it was confusing and incomprehensible, namely educational jargon. As one communit, person commented, "you better talk in a language that everyone can understand, that is, in plain English." The Project staff also had to learn to be usefully visible in the community. Many members of the community felt that the best PR was one to one communication. Another problem cited by several persons was lack of follow through. Promised were made but not kept and, as one local person noted, "people are judged by what they do, not by what they say." Poor management and lack of staff cohesion were also cited as Project weaknesses.

In spite of the very real and obvious problems, community acceptance of and involvement in the Project grew very slowly. According to one person, "The reaction is changing from 'we don't like them around', to 'well, they're harmless and we might get some good out of it." The following comments were made at the close of the first year by persons working with the Project:

- The community is beginning to understand the process.

D. ROLE GROUP PERSPECTIVES - continued
GREENVILLE-COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVE

- Pushing and shoving is now accepted as a way of life
- The community is now viewing Project staff as individual members of the community rather than just as part of a federal Project.
- People are getting more tolerant.
- The Project has got the idea and line to take to get the community involved - there is probably a gain in momentum in this direction all the time.

Community work has been cited by numerous persons interviewed at the close of the first year as a strength of the Project. The following were also identified by community members as major Project accomplishments:

- The community building
- Classes offered/materials
- Everybody learning things/minute changes of attitudes
- Materials
- Masters degree program
- Media Center
- Workshops offered
- Seeing the community involved

YEAR II

Eighteen community persons representing a wide variety of roles were interviewed in June 1979 at the close of the Project. Five of these persons had been totally univolved in Project activities, four had been deeply involved through committees and/or workshops/courses. The remainder were involved to varying degrees in some aspect(s) of the Project. Eight women and ten men were interviewed.

Reactions to the Project at this time ranged from an emphatic "positive" to a disgruntled, "Don't do it, it's a waste of money." A majority of persons interviewed (13 of 18) however, stated that they were glad the Project came to Greenville, despite problems which may have arisen. Only two persons commented that they wished it had never come and the other three didn't know. The most negative responses were from persons who had not been involved and the most positive from people who had been deeply involved. Ratings regarding the usefulness of the Project (one a 1 - 5 point scale,) ranged from 0 ( 1 response) to 5 (3 responses,) with an average of 3.2. 16 of 18 persons interviewed wanted to see the Project continue. As one person said, "Otherwise I feel my tax dollars have been wasted." Another commented that two years wasn't long enough and that continuation was necessary "to get the full effect of what they were trying to do." Two other persons stated they would like to see it continue only if it was "reorganized" or "overhauled," with a focus on continuing education. Two persons didn't want it to continue. One commented that he "didn't like to see all that rubbish-putting other people in disturbing the school." Another stated: "We are already paying teachers. Why pay Teacher Corps to come in and do the teachers' jobs?"

Increased community involvement and awareness was cited by most community persons interviewed (13 of 18) as the greatest accomplishment of the Project. Some referred specifically to increased community involvement in schools; i.e. parents who didn't know they could see records, doing so, and conferencing at the school with school personnel. Others spoke of increased involvement in town affairs as well as school affairs, i.e., dealing with issues as drug and alcohol abuse and family planning. Many commented on the effect the Project had personally on some community persons, through involvement in such activities. As one person noted: "They have

GREENVILLE - COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #II
(continued)

brought people out of the woodwork to work as a group and help the community. It has brought some people out who would never have come out before. If you helped one person out of a hundred to come out of the closet it has been a success." Other specific accomplishments cited included the following:

- A.V. room
- interns
- University awareness of Greenville
- contact with blacks, a Jewish family
- a new resource list at the school
- establishment of French program
- not a hell of a lot
- inservice training
- equipment
- consultants
- has stimulated people to think
- seeing a community person saying to a superintendent, "I don't understand what you are saying."
- a person learning to read
- Rural Conference/Human Services

Major weaknesses/trouble spots of the Project that were cited by community persons varied considerably. Problems in communication and/or management were cited by over half of the persons interviewed, although several felt that communication and management had improved considerably from the first year to second year. According to them, information wasn't clear, roles and responsibilities were not clear, the Project was unorganized at the start and follow up were not provided. Another weakness cited by several persons was personality conflicts and staffing. Some felt local people should have been hired rather than outsiders. One person felt that a staff person should have worked at the University not in Greenville. Extravagance of money was also a concern to some persons interviewed. Several persons who had not been involved in the Project simply didn't feel it was necessary: "Kids are trained when they come out of school, it burns me up to have Teacher Corps come up and reteach them. And it comes out of my pocket."

The following concerns were also expressed:

- too short
- The CEC wasn't representative of the town
- poor working relationship between SAD #2 administration and Teacher Corps staff.

Many suggestions to ease the troubles of the Project were made. Several persons commented on the need for earlier planning, involvement of more people from the start, and researching the area first. One person suggested: "Before you go into any community, sit down with key personnel to assess needs, find out what has been done, what should be done and then involve everyone you can get to meet specific goals geared to that community." A third of the persons interviewed made a plea for careful selection of staff, particularly the Director, several felt local people should be hired and a Director with "ties to the community - someone with the faith of the community." According to one person, "There are a lot of people in town capable of doing this stuff and being a lot more help to the people and the kids."

GREENVILLE - COMMUNITY PERSPECITVE - YEAR #II
(continued)

Additional specific suggestions are reviewed below:

- A larger PSC with a majority of the school board on the council. The council should be outweighed by community people with lots of emphasis on the housewife, woodsman - people who aren't normally involved.
- More emphasis on community people than teachers.
- Send things home with the kids so the public can hear about it.
- Form a more broadly representative group on the CEC.
- Get business involved.
- Work in leadership training - a good interpersonal skills course (everybody needs training.)
- If you have doubts when you're interviewing, sit on it.

One interview closed with this bit of advice: "Watch out for the Washington sharpies and do what you want to do. If you can't do it the way you want to, don't take the Project. The community knows best what they need."

2. GREENVILLE - SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #I

The reaction of school people to the Teacher Corps Project varied. Some teachers were closely involved with the Project and were eager to take advantage of resources the Project might offer. Others had nothing to do with it. Some actively sought it out, others just sat back waiting for the Teacher Corps to come to them. Several teachers initially felt that they had been mislead, that they would have a consultant working with them in their area of discipline, that interns would be working in classes, and that they could take a graduate program in any area. In other words, they thought they would be able to complete a masters degree in two years. Others had specific ideas about what they thought the Project staff should be doing. People were impatient and wanted to see things happening immediately. Such early expectations disappeared slowly. By January, however, the relationship between the Teacher Corps and teachers appeared to have improved, due primarily to the delivery of services and intern assistance, plus increased visibility of staff. A majority of persons interviewed at this time felt that things were indeed getting better. As one teacher stated, "It initially was a mess - the usual growing pains - but now they are producing."

Although the school response to the Project slowly improved over the first year, problems and concerns continued to be expressed. The credibility gap, caused by unclear expectations, lessened only over time, as products were delivered. The major problem, however, and unclear expectations falls under this category, was one of communication. In January poor communication was cited by a majority of people interviewed as a major problem, although some felt it had improved since September. One teacher commented: "It has gone from none to better, though it still has a long way to go."

At the close of the first year it was still recognized as a problem. Eight school people interviewed in September 1978 cited the following as Project weaknesses:

. Lack of communication

2. GREENVILLE - SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #I (continued)

. What have they done?
. Questions weren't answered about needed course work
. poor management
. communication problems
. confronting issues
. lack of staff cohesion
. lack of communication and trust (people don't really listen.)

Most of these concerns dealt with problems in communication. Throughout the year, teachers continued to request more and clearer information on what was happening in the Project and who was responsible. Roles, responsibilities and Project goals were not clear to them.

The amount of money being spent was also of concern to several teachers. Some felt money was being spent where it didn't need to be and that it could be better used in other ways. As one teacher wryly remarked, "Rather than send two people to Georgia, why not send 22 kids to the capitol?"

Many school persons appreciated the involvement and efforts of UMF faculty. All persons interviewed in January and September responded positively to their contact with UMF staff. Their work was consistently cited as a major strength of the Project. Materials made available and the summer curriculum institute were also identified by teachers as accomplishments of the Project. A review of Project accomplishments cited by school staff in January and in September follows: - January 1978

- interns in classes
- unlimited potential
- Teacher Corps staff, bright and innovative
- connections with UMF
- tying in individual school people with individual UMF staff
- beginning establishment of a media center
- course offerings
- credits
- new ideas/resources/quality people

September 1978

- courses
- people from Farmington
- Masters program
- Curriculum Institute
- Media Center
- exceptional child component
- courses for community
- interns
- materials

One teacher commented in September, at the close of the first year of the Project, that "The Teacher Corps has begun to bring us out of the dark ages of educational technique and equipment!"

YEAR #II

Personal interviews were conducted with all school faculty at the close of the Project, in June 1979. Reactions to the Project at this time from a superlative "fantastic" (the only one in four interviews,) to a noninvolved "I don't want any part of it," to an explicitly negative, "It's been a bunch of bullshit, has hurt our school system and has been a trying time for our school system." Ratings regarding the overall usefulness of the Project to Greenville (on a scale of 1 to 10) ranged from a high of 10 (3 responses) to a low of 1 (3 responses,) with an average of 5-4.

2. GREENVILLE - SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #II
(continued)

Ratings were not related to degree of involvement. All but six (of 44) staff reported that they were glad the Project came to Greenville, although some stated this with reservation, and five of these six spoke positively about some aspect of assistance they had received or service provided. Most school staff had mixed feelings. They were pleased with specific services and materials provided and yet keenly aware of problems, difficulties and obstacles to greater effectiveness.

Forty of forty-seven staff commented on having received assistance in some way that they found meaningful or having gained new information through services provided by the Teacher Corps such as consultants, staff, courses, conferences, or interns.

Thirty-one persons were able to identify specific things they were doing differently, or improvements in teaching, as a result of Teacher Corps services. The staff was split regarding desire for continuation of the Project: half wanted to see it continue and the others did not. Comments about continuation ranged from "We need something like the Teacher Corps. We need financial resources and personnel and we need time to develop these people so they can help us meet our needs," to "I'm glad to see them go so we can get back to our work." Many teachers felt that the Project had done what it could. Several commented on the need for a breather, to evaluate what had been done, and others simply felt that there had been too much waste and too many complaints and that it was time to get back to normal.



A majority of persons interviewed at the close of the Project (29 of 44) felt that communication had improved considerably from the first to second year. Only three of 44 felt it had stayed the same or deteriorated. Such improvement was credited by many to the Director (II) (former Team Leader) who "believes in keeping people informed," "picked up the pieces," "gets out more and actively recruits," and was available. According to many school faculty he was "willing to listen" "well organized," a local - had insights into the school," and "familiar with people."

Time was also cited as a contributing factor. One person commented: "it was inevitable. Over time, people become more aware, whether they like it or not." Another person put some of the responsibility on the teachers themselves: "Maybe more people were interested and asked." Roles and responsibilities, so frequently questioned the first year, were rarely questioned the second year.

Although communication improved the second year, it was cited at the close of the Project - as at its start - by a majority of staff (24 of 44) as the major <u>weakness</u> of the two year Project. Many school persons felt that information given was unclear - "Lots of fluff, lots of big words were used that didn't tell you anything, rather than simple words to explain what was happening." - and "The audience didn't know what the Project was about." Staffing problems were also cited as a Project weakness by over a third of the school staff. Strong feelings were voiced. "A superior know-it-all attitude," and "lack of understanding of rural communities" were criticisms levied against some staff persons.

2. GREENVILLE - SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #II (continued)

As one person stated: "I think they thought we were a bunch of country bumpkins;" And another: "They never learned to accept that we are not intellectuals." Another teacher caustically and negatively commented: "I came to the conclusion that Teacher Corps staff are rejects from teaching, people who can't handle people, who aren't sensitive to others feelings." Serious internal conflicts among Teacher Corps staff were also apparent to many school staff. "The personalities just didn't click," and "An incredible amount of backbiting by some staff was common," according to several SAD #2 staff. Such conflict was recognized as a problem in that "it took away from the potential influencing of the staff."

Lack of follow through by Teacher Corps staff was also cited by several teachers as a Project weakness. Another major problem cited was leadership - or lack of - and lack of organization. As one person noted: "I felt the Project was just floating, due to a vacuum in leadership and organization." The amount of money being spent was also a major concern to many school staff. Over 1/4 of the staff felt that money was wasted or spent unwisely. Additional concerns/weaknesses of the Project that were voiced by school staff included the following:

- No staff came from the University
- the slow start of the Project
- inability to tie in with our schedule
- field-basedness of courses - expected they would bear a direct relationship to teaching
- left out the junior high school
- too theoretical, didn't provide me with practical, day to day skills
- need for more community involvement
- community component - first year was a waste-too slow a start
- so many failed masters
- negative attitude of teachers
- needs assessments - both school and community.

Many suggestions for improvement were made. Many people commented on the need for more time for preplanning - to involve more community and school people (to "get the critics and get some of their ideas,") assess needs, define expectations of the University, and hire staff more carefully. Several staff felt that more local control over the Project was necessary, starting with a local person in the Director's role. Many persons suggested hiring a different staff to fill Teacher Corps positions, hiring people who fit into the community and who were cohesive. Suggestions regarding communication included: "have clear cut objectives," "speak in English," "more memos and newsletters," fewer memos and newsletter," and "clearly define roles and let others know." Additional suggestions voiced are listed below:

- use someone not from town to do needs assessment survey
- put close scrutiny on the budget
- don't do it
- set up courses during non-teaching time
- emphasize practical things
- have a more central office than in basement
- more retreats for staff and follow up
- integrate Teacher Corps with staff
- make definite effort to involve secondary people
- plunge right in
- get Teacher Corps staff out to talk with other Projects

2. GREENVILLE-SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE-YEAR #2 (continued)

- better needs assessment
- Teacher Corps staff to take more initiative with school teachers - seek out rather than sit back
- less high powered interns
- more forceful pushing of SAD #2 needs by administration

In spite of problems, real accomplishments of the Project were cited by school staff as well. Tangible materials left in Greenville (Media Center, science, social studies, math calculators, French) and the availability of courses and the Master of Education program were most frequently cited by school staff at the close of the Project as the greatest accomplishment(s) of the Project. Faculty from UMF and other consultant assistance were also frequently mentioned. According to one person, the Project "rekindled a quest for learning for some," through the "influx of new blood" which "brought Greenville out of its isolation." Many staff also viewed the interns and the assistance they provided as a real strength of the Project. Community involvement was cited by other school staff as the greatest accomplishment. As one person commented, "I don't think the schools will ever be the same. The good part of it is that we have parent involvement." Another staff person noted that parents were coming into the schools to talk about their kids as a result of their involvement with the community component of the Project.

Other Project accomplishments or strengths that were cited by school staff at the close of the Project are reviewed below:

- "It forced people to come together and work."
- "LSDP process - I think it's fantastic."
- "Betty Stead, who is in fact the Director and is honest and loyal and has integrity."
- "bringing teachers out of the college."
- "curriculum committees"
- "helped improve evaluation and set up core curriculum"
- "contact with the University"
- "cross-referencing file"

3. UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON PERSPECTIVE - YEAR #1

Despite 92 long and bumpy miles and a heavy work overload at UMF, faculty members delivered direct services to Greenville people the first year through courses, workshops and consultations. For some, field work was a new experience and a learning one; for others it was familiar ground and hopefully still a learning situation. Some were more effective than others. Some had difficulty with the open-ended and sometimes ambiguous nature of the consulting role. Others set up their own structures and expectations and thrived in the freedom. But they were all concerned and interested enough to get involved. The opportunity for field work and the stimulation it provides attracted them. Money was obviously an incentive to start, few persons would take on responsibilities as the Greenville Project demanded without financial compensation.

However, all UMF faculty interviewed in both December and September appeared to be sincerely interested in and concerned about the Project. By the end of the first year, however, the enthusiasm of a majority of UMF faculty involved in the Project waned considerably despite interest in the Project and most particularly the teachers in Greenville. Nearly all

3. UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON PERSPECTIVE
YEAR #1 -(continued)

faculty interviewed in September cited their interaction with teachers as the most meaningful aspect of their involvement with the Project and yet many expressed deep reservations about returning to Greenville. The following were cited as the most frustrating aspects of involvement with the Project:

- lack of organization
- poor roads
- difficult to get hold of someone/lack of contact with campus
- would be approached but not followed through/ talk but no action
- didn't get asked to do enough
- not having a clearly defined role in working with teachers
- didn't feel I was effective
- expectations were out of keeping with what was going on
- no formal channels of communication/all gossip
- communication problems/scheduling conflicts
- didn't feel appreciated
- no clear role definition, everyone had different ideas about what I was to do
- political aspect, not sure if symptomatic of UMF or Project

Many of the frustrations were rooted in the management of the linkage between Greenville and Farmington. According to UMF faculty, channels of communication were not clear and the "grapevine" was the major information source for many people. One faculty member wryly noted,"we really are 90 miles apart."



In addition to communication problems, many faculty felt that their roles and expectations of them were extremely unclear and undefined, leading to a sense of lack of purpose, wasted time and ineffectiveness for some. All faculty interviewed in December expressed the need for greater clarity regarding specific teacher needs. By September several faculty members commented that they would return only if teacher needs were clearly articulated. Another stated he would not return because it was too taxing unless the persons he had previously worked with specifically requested it. (He had thoroughly enjoyed his students and in turn was highly regarded by them.)

Additional comments about troublespots or weaknesses of the Project, cited the first year, included the following:

- Teacher Corps overload too much at one time
- interns, too much put on them at one time
- decision making wasn't centralized
- ineffective, inefficient planning
- need of release time for teachers
- lack of Teacher Corps staff cohesion
- distrust between Project staff and school people
- lack of up-front support from administration
- buying faculty on overload basis
- distance-driving

Some concrete suggestions were made:

- more people have to interface, possibly more meetings/meet informally with teachers and faculty
- meeting of everyone to summarize feelings

3. UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON PERSPECTIVE
YEAR #1 -(continued)

- identify parameters we're working in (i.e., how much money each one of us has to spend on materials, etc.)
- fly professors out
- University van for travel
- pay more money for CED courses
- right from the start, contact UMF and get together and toss around strengths and weaknesses
- confrontation
- continual feedback
- spell out expectations early
- more group decisions rather than individual
- knowledge of budget
- amount of money spent must be less visible
- regularly scheduled contact with Project staff - Director on campus more.

In spite of very real problems and frustrations, most faculty feel that accomplishments have been made and the Project had made an impact of some sort on teachers, community persons and UMF faculty as well. The following were cited at the close of the first year as Project accomplishments:

- people have gained professionally
- I'm impressed the the Project supports University people up in Greenville consulting, rather than just teaching courses
- faculty have seen that they can go out and deliver training. It is a reciprocal impact. I'm aware that more faculty than I thought can go out in the field.
- graduate work
- faculty aware of how education can be up there
- we learned some things about what we can and can't do
- there have been tangible changes. The community is not aware
- the Project has refocused the community to look differently at the schools.

The extent of UMF commitment to field-based in-service efforts appears to have been determined by the interest and involvement of individual faculty members. Nearly all faculty interviewed recently felt that the University as an institution was not really committed to in-service education. One person commented that "The University sees it as something we ought to do but isn't aware of what's involved in doing it." Another noted that the University is "sitting on a fence" at present, with some individuals intellectually committed and yet in conflict with the mission of UMF, namely pre-service education.

YEAR II:

The second year of the Project consultants from campuses and agencies including U.M.A., U.M.O., U.S.M. and the State Department of Education provided services in Greenville, in addition to U.M.F. staff. Sixteen IHE persons involved in the Project were interviewed at the close of the Project in June 1979. All but two staff interviewed at this time stated that they were glad the Project came to Greenville although the responses of many were reserved. The difficulties inherent in delivering services to a remote area and attempting to unite different groups and institutions were clear. Although some staff felt that the Project was needed

3. UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON PERSPECTIVE
YEAR #2 (continued)

and should continue - ("It is essential to exhibit a model of revitalizing rural areas.") - a majority of persons interviewed felt it should not continue and that "it wasn't needed any more," or that it would be necessary to start off somewhere else. One person commented that to continue, the Project would have to be cleaned up and that considering such adversary groups, the Project might need a new University as well as a new staff.

All faculty interviewed cited their dealings with people in Greenville as the most meaningful aspect of their involvement in the Project. As one person noted: "For the first time I wasn't in the lecture hall. I found myself really involved with people. It forced me to extend myself into the community." Frustrations, however, were common. The same professor who spoke sincerely of the value of involvement with Greenville people, also made the following comment: "My whole involvement has been frustrating. Satisfaction has been peripheral. Teacher Corps has a tendency to undercompensate people working for them and involvement is so demanding that when you finish you feel you wouldn't do it again. I don't feel supported for my effort."

Lack of UMF University support was identified by some staff as well. One faculty member stated, "They have a knack for pricking initiative and taking the air out." Another commented that the organization and attitude of the University was anti-thetical to IHE staff involvement, having to teach on an overload basis. According to one UMF faculty person "even release time was crazy!" The fact that USM rather than UMF was the degree granting institution compounded the problem.

Communication was also cited as a problem. ("No one here at UMF knows what anyone else is doing",) along with poor coordination between UMF, USM and Greenville. Several persons felt that the greatest weakness(es) of the Project lay in management and staff, as it "wasn't rooted in SAD #2 or UMF, compounding the we/they." Some felt that "too many Teacher Corps staff were in Greenville." Additional problems identified by IHE staff included the following:

- no one assumed a check on management
- lack of IHE staff involvement in needs assessment
- Teacher Corps staff didn't involve Greenville
- teachers having too much to do
- coordinating academic program with ongoing home/job commitments
- travel
- rushing in too fast

Although communication was cited as a problem, all but one person who had worked with the Project both years felt that communication had improved from the first to the second year. Many credited such improvement to the new Director who "made positive attempts to be clear," and "was more personal - less written information." One UMF faculty commented: "I now feel I can get answers."

Suggestions for improvements were similar to those ordered by school persons, except from a University perspective. Many faculty members commented on the need for more preliminary planning "involving personnel from the degree granting institution," to assess needs, and "know the school and community in advance," to involve community people and establish

3. UNIVERSITY OF MAINE, FARMINGTON PERSPECTIVE
YEAR #2 (continued)

communication with the community, and to schedule release time for faculty (as part of their load.) Several persons felt that existing faculty from the degree granting institution should be hired as Teacher Corps staff with "an IHE accepted person in the Directorship." One faculty member suggested "starting from the beginning with existing University faculty, having the Project grow out of the college, not as an appendage." Other suggestions included careful selection of Project staff with experience in public schools and a task-oriented Director, (rather than theory-oriented,) a carefully designed organizational structure, and follow through of stated plans. One IHE faculty member felt that local people should be hired.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

Two major problems repeatedly voiced by Project participants in all role groups were management (Year #I) and staffing. Which came first is unclear. Ineffectual management may have led to or increased inappropriate performance on the part of some staff (as some contend) or inappropriate staffing may have promoted or compounded ineffective management. Some degree of truth probably lies in both statements. These two areas of concern as well as other problems which afflicted the Project are discussed below:

1. Staffing

The Project was originally designed to be staffed by five persons including two UMF faculty (Director and PDS,) one person qualified for undergraduate and graduate status at the University (core faculty,) one SAD #2 faculty (Team Leader) and one community person who would be a member of the SAD #2 faculty (Community Coordinator.) Such a staffing pattern would ensure some degree of local, school and UMF support. In reality, two local persons - the assistant principal and the editor of the local paper - were hired to fill the roles of Team Leader and Community Coordinator, but the three other primary roles of Director, Program Development Specialist and Core Faculty were filled by persons who were outsiders of both UMF and Greenville. All Project staff persons thus lacked direct experience and understanding of UMF - its procedures, personnel, policies and politics - and the persons who were to work most closely (by job definition) with the school personnel - the core faculty and PDS - were "aliens" to SAD #2 as well. All staff were based in Greenville, compounding the isolation from UMF. The distance, figurative as well as literal, between Greenville and UMF was a long and bumpy 92 miles which did not diminish as the Project progressed. From its start - in part due to the staffing pattern - the Project was set up as a separate entity, apart from both UMF and SAD #2. It was viewed as such throughout most of its lifespan. Strong and active institutional support from SAD #2 and UMF was lacking.

As stated above, the Project staffing was not the most ideal. In addition to an "alien" status of three staff members, strong interpersonal and communication skills and a sensitivity to realities of living in an isolated, rural community were lacking on the part of several staff persons, reducing their effectiveness. The talents of some staff were misplaced, skills which might be appropriate in University or other settings were not the most appropriate or relevant to Project needs in Greenville.

The roles of both the PDS and Core Faculty also changed somewhat from those originally proposed.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

1. Staffing - continued

The proposed roles called for a person with strength in in-service staff development and a content specialist in one of the proposed thrusts. In reality the skills and strengths of these two staff persons lay in other areas than those designated and their roles changed accordingly. Expectations die hard, however, leading to grumbles and prejudices which dissipated only over time, and in some cases not at all. In addition the shifting of roles left somewhat of a void in the arenas of inservice development and in content. No staff person was a basic skills content specialists or a specialist in mainstreaming, as designated in the original proposal. Several persons complained that the entire staff were simply administrators.

2. Management

The management of the Project the first year was somewhat chaotic. Project goals and objectives were not clearly identified, long range planning was not readily apparent, roles and responsibilities were unclear, follow-up assistance was lacking, a system of accountability was non-existent, decision making patterns were unknown and communication was less than "open and out front." Some of these concerns are discussed in greater depth below:

The first year of the Project appeared to be afflicted with lack of direction. Major Project goals and objectives were never really clearly identified and systematic planning incorporating long and short range goals was not apparent in either the inservice or community components of the Project. Instead, the Project was supposedly developmental, with goals (and plans) emerging as time progressed. The result was short term and reactionary planning for isolated programs/activities (with some notable exceptions such as the exceptionality program and the summer institute.) No clear sense of a larger picture existed and the relationship of activities to larger goals, or roles to goals was also not clear. Such lack of clarity added fuel to role ambiguity. The result was the appearance of a haphazard and unorganized Project in which lots of ideas were thrown around, with a limited number being acted on.

Attempts were made at the start of the Project to define roles and responsibilities of Project staff in accordance with skills, knowledge and interests, rather than in accordance with job titles. After all, a resume and two hour interview only say so much about a person. Roles were assigned, removed in some cases when the Director questioned the competence of the staff person, and taken on in other cases if of particular interest to a person. The problem was that the roles became so fluid that no one - including the staff at times - was sure of what staff responsibilities were. This was particularly so with the PDS and Core Faculty, whose roles were shaped over time and were not those designated in the proposal. The ambiguity of roles caused considerable frustration for both staff and participants. Loud cries for clear statements of roles and responsibilities were heard repeatedly the first year from Greenville and UMF personnel, particularly regarding the Core Faculty, whose activities were less visible than other staff.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

2. Management - continued

Role fluidity increased the communication problem. People didn't know who to turn to for information regarding a particular activity or program. The grapevine became a major source of information. The roles of the Community Coordinator and Team Leader were less ambiguous, in part due to the more concrete nature of their roles, each being attached to a specific part of the Project, and in part due to the self-initiating and visible operational style of these two persons who were both local and visible in the community.

The Project staff operated relatively autonomously the first year of the Project. Room was purposefully provided for them to find their own niche, in accordance with talents and interests. Such autonomy, however, requires a high level of task related "maturity," which, was not exhibited/nor to be expected at the start of the Project such as this, staffed by new people in new roles.

The Community Coordinator and Team Leader, both local and self-initiating by personality, were able to function within such autonomy, (although not comfortably, to start.) More direction and follow-up assistance, however, would probably have been more suitable for the rest of the staff. The PSC was also left to struggle alone with the definition of its role and the development of leadership skills. Assistance through training or other means was not provided. Although real skills and confidence did in fact develop, the lack of direction to start was a deep frustration to PSC members.



In addition to lack of follow up and assistance, no system of staff accountability/evaluation was built into the Project for any staff member, including the Director. No system of checks and balances existed. If the staff did not follow through with designated or self-assigned tasks, or if performance was inadequate, tasks were simply reassigned or not done. Roles were adjusted to fit the staff rather than staff adjusted to fit the roles. This greatly aggravated management problems.

Attempts were made the second year of the Project by the Director (II) to establish an accountability system, largely through clear definition of responsibilities and expectations. The reward system however, was largely intrinsic - the satisfaction of doing what you were responsible for, and doing it well. Few tangible incentives, such as job security or salary, existed at this stage in the Project. This proved to be somewhat of a problem, particularly with one staff person who responded to more tangible incentives.

Decision-making channels were not clear the first year of the Project, although the Director appeared to control the flow of information as well as decisions. No one seemed to know who was accountable for what and who had the "power" to make or act on decisions. This caused frustration for participants who were hearing words of "collaboration" and yet felt they had no real power. Not knowing clearly who did have the power added to the confusion. The Director tended to operate on a one-to-one management and decision-making basis which also led to problems as some decisions and promises were made that were unrealistic and unfeasible, as other

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

2. Management - continued

significant persons needed to be involved in the decisions in order for them to be implemented, and resulted at times in good intentions but lack of follow through.

3. Communication

Open channels of communication between participating persons and organizations were obviously central to the success of the Project. The isolated nature of Greenville only heightened this need. This was not the case, the "infamous communication problems" (so labeled by a UMF professor) plagued the Project the first year, since its conception. The management system did not establish and maintain clear lines of communication between participating groups, nor did Project players rise above personal agendas, concerns and perspectives. It was not clear to Project participants what the Project was about, what was happening, nor who to turn to for information. Role fluidity added to the problem. Many people didn't bother to ask and simply grumbled. The "grapevine" became a major source of information and many people were only too willing to believe everything they heard. Most Project staff were not visible in the schools. Information giving pieces were not consistently disseminated and were not read by many who on the one hand complained that not enough was written, and yet didn't want another thing to read.

Repeated complaints were heard from Greenville people about use of "jargonese" and language



they didn't understand. (It's interesting to note, by the end of the Project, some community people who were at one time so critical about jargon, as they understood, adopted "jargonese" themselves.)

Few regular meetings were held between key participants of varying role groups to share information and provide feedback, Clear linkages between Farmington and Greenville were not established. Each UMF person seemed to have a different staff person to whom they turned, and even that wasn't clear. Such confusion led to scheduling problems and heightened the already existing uncertainty about roles and expectations of UMF persons.

In addition to unclear channels of communication, communication skills were not evident the first year of the Project. Many persons had difficulty openly discussing differing viewpoints and confronting people constructively about concerns. Instead, concerns were discussed behind people's backs. Grumbling and backbiting ran rampant. Interpersonal and philosophical conflicts compounded the problem. No training in communication skills was provided. In short, communication was not "open and out front." Communication improved considerably the second year due to time and the new Director.

4. Collaboration

Collaboration, a key ideal underlying the Project, was a struggle for participants throughout the lifespan of the Project, particularly the first year. The first year was a we/they, win/lose arena and was pervaded with an atmosphere of distrust. All key participants had different perspectives and most

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

4. Collaboration - continued

had great difficulty modifying their version of what should be (which is of course only their version) and considering others perspectives and realities. Few persons demonstrated problem solving and communication skills necessary for collaboration and no training was provided to help people acquire these skills. Sustained contact between Project staff and UMF and SAD #2 decision-makers were either not developed or were limited. Personalities and professional beliefs clashed and walls went up which some people - staff and otherwise - did not attempt to remove. The most notable void was with the assistant principal, who, as leader of the curriculum effort, was central to school change. The Team Leaders (I and II) were the only staff people who established a positive working relationship with her. A role change for the assistant principal (formerly the special education director) and a state mandated self-evaluation process which both coincided with the start of the Teacher Corps Project compounded the problem. Over time, through regular contact, some groups such as the PSC and CEC emerged as collaborative bodies, and collaborative efforts between some Project staff and participants increased. The Community Coordinator worked with the principal and UMF Deans and the Field-based Instructor worked with several UMF faculty.

5. Splintered Staff

The Project staff was composed of a diverse group of people of differing educational backgrounds - religious, ethnic and geographical backgrounds. Such a composition offered a broad range of attributes from high to low energy, professional to grass roots approach, sophistication to provinciality, methodical to initiutive and undisciplined working styles, product to process orientation. It was quite a mixture and such diversity was potentially a strength of the Project and cited as such by staff and school people at its start. In practice, however, the diversity proved to be a problem. The staff had enormous problems working together and were viewed throughout the first year as individuals rather than as members of a team. A splintered rather than united front was presented.

Due to interpersonal and philosophical conflicts, very little teaming occurred and little sense of staff loyality and support existed. The staff simply couldn't work together. Overt backbiting by several staff further undermined the group. This was unfortunate as a foundation of mutual support and strength as a group could have strengthened the Project and on a personal level could have eased some of the difficulties and frustrations of being involved as "aliens" in a new start Project in a very isolated region. Some attempts were made the first year to deal constructively with the problem through two staff retreats and training sessions with an outside consultant. These sessions were viewed very positively by staff, however, no follow up occurred and increased awareness didn't lead to changes in behavior or attitudes.

The second year marked a considerable improvement over the first, as the staff, following the resignation of the Director (I) were united by the common goal of survival. The ensuing leadership also prompted open communication and confrontation. Interaction between staff members was healthier and more open, although little actual teaming took place. The staff continued to work individually.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

6. Slow Start/Process vs. Products

The Project was slow in getting off the ground and with the exception of several school workshops, no products were visible in either the inservice or community components until after Christmas. Little negotiating appeared to have been done over the summer and when Project staff were on board and schools opened in September, information regarding University requirements for degrees, and options and availability of staff were still unknown. Such background work was done in the fall. This led to unanswered questions, false expectations and got the Project off to a bad start.

People were impatient with whatever "process" was going on and wanted to see visible indicators of their taxpayers dollars! Process didn't count as far as they were concerned, time was being wasted. Lack of visibility of staff in schools and community added to the problem. Complaints about what the Project was up to diminished as products started to be delivered and staff was more visible.

7. Visibility of Dollars

The visibility of federal Teacher Corps monies was offensive to many Greenville people. Some felt that things were just fine as they were and resented the fact their "taxpayers dollars" were being spent on such a Project to begin with. To them, it was another "federal ripoff." Many were suspicious of federal programs particularly in light of having been recently "burned" by a sewage treatment plant. Others simply felt that money was spent carelessly. Many were unable to see a value in or a need for flying people to Greenville (rather than driving,) sending people to conferences around the country, taking people out to dinner, or paying a consultant to "facilitate" a meeting. The Teacher Corps use and visibility of money conflicted with the values of many Greenville people.

8. Lack of Follow Through

Lack of follow through was a problem throughout the Project. Repeated examples of promises being made and then not followed through - by Project staff and by consultants - were voiced by Greenville people and by consultants. Many of these promises were relatively minor, i.e., a teacher being told by a consultant that a book would be delivered, or follow-up visits provided, and then never showing; or a consultant being told he would be teaching a course which never took place. Nonetheless, people remembered things they were told. In an isolated region such as Greenville, with limited resources, people don't forget. Idle promises which were not met led to disappointments and grumbles.

The second year, implementation of designated staff responsibilities was spotty. Although responsibilities of most staff were in fact met, considerable prodding and reminding to some persons by the Director (II) was necessary and many tasks were not completed by designated time lines. Reasons for the lack of follow through according to time lines varied from staff person to person, from lack of

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

8. Lack of Follow Through - continued

time and overextension of energies, to poor planning, to lack of motivation and incentives.

One staff person was plagued with chronic lack of follow through, agreeing to a responsibility and then backing out of it, for one reason or another, or completing the assigned task only upon prodding by the Director. Such patterns resulted in some cases in inefficiency of implementation, frustration for those affected by the action(s) (or lack of) and exacerbated the task of Project planning and management.

9. Needs Assessment

Although a variety of tools assessing needs were utilized throughout the Project, a planned ongoing system assessing both the broader needs of the district and of UMF, as well as the needs and competencies of individuals, was not designed nor implemented by the Teacher Corps in either the inservice or community components of the Project. Direct linkages of needs that were assessed with delivery of services were also not readily apparent.

SAD #2 district needs were identified through the self-evaluation process the first year and some attempts were made by the Teacher Corps to attend to some of these needs, although with widely varying degrees of success (i.e., exceptionality program to junior high effort.) No ongoing system actively assessing individual teachers needs was emplaced, however, the first year of the Project. The INSERV process was a major attempt but the process of working through two committees was cumbersome,



could not respond quickly enough to teacher needs and soon died. The individualization program, also serving to some extent as a means of assessing individual teacher's needs, died as well. As a result, many services offered by the Teacher Corps, including most courses, were offered in response to Master of Education needs, with a focus on exceptionality, and did not meet the needs and interests of most content specialists. Only four of twelve 3-credit courses delivered over the lifespan of the Project were offered directly in response to stated school needs. The second year the SAD #2 curriculum committees, supported by Teacher Corps monies, served increasingly as a needs assessment tool, meeting the needs of individuals as well as the district.

The needs assessment conducted in the spring, 1978, through personal interviews with all SAD #2 staff, served a variety of purposes including interaction of Teacher Corps staff with school personnel, dissemination of information about the Teacher Corps, and assessment of teacher needs. Such an informal, personal needs assessment and PR tool would probably have been useful at the start of the Project. As it was, the Year #II activities had already been planned and no linkages between data collected and services delivered were apparent.

The community needs assessment provided a wealth of information about Greenville which may have long lasting value, (although such information soon becomes outdated.) The process may also have been a good experience for those involved. The needs assessment did not, however, really serve as a needs assessment for the Project and did not influence services that were delivered. As with

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

9. Needs Assessment - continued

INSERV, the process was cumbersome, time consuming and did not provide quick, updated information about Greenville needs. Instead, needs were assessed informally, primarily through the CEC. Such an informal approach has merits in unearthing interests of persons who are involved and vicariously, interests of others. The danger, however, lies in assessing the needs and biases of a limited number of individuals. No ongoing, planned means of assessing broader community needs as well as individual needs was designed or implemented.

10. Staff Development - Secondary Teachers

As noted, above, the needs of SAD #2 content specialists - primarily secondary teachers - were identified and responded to only peripherally throughout the Project, through the short lived individualization program the first year and the curriculum committees the second year. Plans to deal with needs of junior high, identified as a need through SAD #2 self-evaluation process, never really got off the ground due to lack of SAD #2 and Teacher Corps support. Systematic efforts by the Teacher Corps to deliver services to junior and senior high staff were limited to the curriculum institute co-collaborative effort with SAD #2 administration and curriculum committees (owned by SAD #2,) and the focus on exceptionality excluded most content specialists.

As indicated by data presented in the chart below the involvement of elementary teachers was considerably greater than secondary, in part due to the interests of Teacher Corps staff and interns, and in part due to a tendency - which has been thoroughly documented by researchers for years - of many secondary school systems and staff to be more resistant to change efforts than elementary systems and staff.

INVOLVEMENT OF SAD #2 FACULTY IN TEACHER CORPS SERVICES

| Elementary | Secondary |
|---|---|
| 11/15 took one or more courses(excluding curriculum institute) | 3/15 took one or more courses (excluding curriculum institute (eight took no courses four took curriculum institute) |
| 5/15 took five or more courses | 2/15 took two or three courses |
| 4/15 enrolled in Master of Education | 0/15 enrolled in Master of Education |
| 9/15 worked with Teacher Corps Interns | 4/15 worked with T.C.interns |
| 12/15 were assisted by consultants or by Teacher Corps staff | 8/15 were assisted by consultants or T.C. staff |
| 9/15 participated in conferences or visits outside Greenville | 6/15 participated in conferences or visits outside of Greenville |
| 7/15 participated in conferences in Greenville | 4/15 participated in conferences in Greenville |

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

10. Staff Development - Secondary Teachers

INVOLVEMENT OF SAD #2 FACULTY IN TEACHER CORPS SERVICES - continued

| Specialists | Administration |
|---|---|
| 8/12 took one or more courses | 3/4 took one course |
| 2/12 took five or more courses (Special Ed.) | - - - - 0/4 took more than one course |
| 1/12 enrolled in Master of Education | 0/4 enrolled in Master of Education |
| 4/12 worked with interns(3 Special Ed.) | 1/4 worked with intern |
| 8/12 were assisted by consultants or T.C. staff | 3/4 were assisted by consultants |
| 7/10 participated in conferences or visits outside of Greenville | 3/4 participated in conferences or visits outside Greenville |
| 6/12 participated in conferences in Greenville | 4/4 participated in conferences in Greenville |

No systematic means of assessing UMF faculty needs/interests, or of involving or informing them was designed or implemented, compounding the communication problem and inefficient use of potential resources at UMF.



11. Consultant Role

Being a consultant in the field can be stimulating and exciting as well as intensely frustrating. The freedom from course requirements and the time it potentially offers a consultant for individual work with teachers can be viewed as a great advantage. Unless the role is defined, however, it can be extremely frustrating, sometimes dysfunctionally so. Such was the case for some consultants in Greenville. Most arrived in Greenville not knowing what to expect nor what the participants' needs and concerns were. Their roles were not defined by Teacher Corps, by SAD #2, or, in some cases, by the consultant. Some consultants were not in Greenville long enough or consistently enough to assess client needs and formulate appropriate strategies for assistance. For those in Greenville for a limited amount of time it was more difficult.

Some consultants were able to set their own structures and expectations within which to operate and did so with ease. Others were not able to do so. It's one thing to give a workshop or teach a course in one's area of expertise to a group of teachers, and another to work individually with teachers and try to respond to their wants (as they perceive) and needs (as you perceive.) Unrealistic promises were made by some consultants, resulting in lack of follow through.

The linkage of UMF consultants with the SAD #2 self-evaluation process was potentially a real plus. The timing, however, was inappropriate. Some consultants who were content specialists were put in the role of facilitator. Some possessed these skills

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

11. Consultant Role

and others didn't, again causing frustration for both consultants and teachers. The second year of the Project, when the committees were operating more smoothly, content specialists could have been very useful. At this time, however, the Teacher Corps staff played a relatively passive role in seeking out resources which might benefit the committees and such consultant services were barely utilized.

Such problems were compounded by poor coordination between Greenville and consultants, Such responsibilities were dispersed between several staff persons and numerous examples of crossed notices were cited by participants; i.e., a consultant arriving on the wrong day; a consultant not being informed of a scheduled meeting and not showing; a consultant arriving when teachers had not been informed; teachers being told when to meet but not why; a consultant showing up when the students didn't. Too many middle managers resulted in a breakdown of accurate information flow between Teacher Corps staff, teachers and consultants. The timing of consultant visits was also difficult. Although classroom time for demonstrations and observations was considered useful, student free time for consultation and feedback was scarce and difficult to schedule.

Coordination of services ran more smoothly the second year when many consultants dealt directly with clients.

12. Field-Based Instruction

Some instructors in Greenville were very successful in teaching academically sound, needs responsive, field-based courses in Greenville. Others were less successful, delivering courses that were considered either irrelevant to participant needs or were not academically sound. Field-based inservice instruction is no easy task. Teaching a course in the "field" outside the structure, comfort, resources, (and safety) of a University presents unique problems which many professors in Greenville faced.

First of all, as one professor noted, the pressure from the students, who "pull on emotional heartsprings" to reduce course expectations and quality is constant. Professors are continually bombarded with groans of how busy everyone is. Most participants are working full time, or its equivalent, whether teacher or otherwise, and regardless of how interested and motivated they are, time is a real problem. Time is limited and participants will readily complain about too many readings, too many papers to do, etc. The time problem becomes a constant, consistent way of dealing with things they don't want to do. The pressure is for convenience and some professors, in their earnest attempts to "meet the needs of the students," end up catering to student "wants" and lowering realistic course expectations as well as quality.

Informality, characteristic of field-based courses, may also create problems. Some professors got lost in the friendly, low keyed atmosphere of Greenville (also a fine tool for manipulation, whether intended or not!) and dissolved course structure and expectations. Several Greenville teachers complained because courses were too easy and yet they themselves were the ones who pushed for convenience. Some were torn between wanting academic vigor, but given the realities of time,

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

12. Field-based Instruction - continued

desire for a degree and extra money, wanting to push through as much as possible, as easily as possible. The balance between being sensitive to real needs of teachers and standards of quality is a tricky one. Some professors achieved this balance and others went overboard one way or the other, usually down grading courses.

Field-based inservice courses are often characterized by a continual ebb and flow of participants which may vary from session to session, even hour to hour. Legitimate things happen that disrupt meetings, such as a fire which caused the prompt departure of the town fire chief. Instructors have to be prepared and flexible for dealing with such situations, whether making provisions for alternate work for people who can't come to class (and students will argue they don't really need the make up,) or rescheduling sessions for those who can't show.

Given the nature of the participants and local conditions, field-based courses demand more individualization and also more time on the part of the professor (if they care and are committed to teaching a good course.) Some instructors in Greenville were willing and able, others were not.

For all the extra time and energy which field-based instruction demands, instructors in Greenville were paid the regular CED fee, apparently an immutable figure.

Diversity of participant population creates a challenge to field-based instructors. Many courses offered through the community component of the Project were composed of a particulary diverse population. How do you structure a course to meet the needs of a student who hasn't been in the classroom for over 30 years, as well as one who recently graduated from Harvard? This is no easy task!

Student anxiety and fear of failure, is another concern which instructors had to deal with. Although such anxiety is common to many students of college courses, it is particularly acute for students who have been out of the academic sphere for a long time and presents an added challenge for instructors.

According to one professor who taught in Greenville, if you teach in the field "you can't be hung up on the quarters where you teach." Instructors in Greenville had to accept moving around from one location to another, sometimes within one session. Courses were taught in a variety of places including participants' homes, the Greenville Inn (dining room and/or bar,) the superintendent's office, the community office, the Teacher Corps office, the home economics room, the library, etc. Some professors felt comfortable in the role of transient, invading someone elses territory and others did not.

Libraries were not accessible for people in Greenville. Instead, materials had to be provided by the instructors, who ran into problems with secretarial services, duplicating machinery, costs and responsibilities, compounding difficulties of field-based instruction.

Scheduling and dealing with student fatigue is a real problem with field-based inservice courses. People who are working full time are tired and rightfully so. This puts an added pressure on the instructor to build energy rather than simply being understanding and catering to low, low energy.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

12. Field-Based Instruction - continued

Courses in Greenville were also scheduled in long time blocks, since instructors were traveling considerable distances, ranging from three hours to five hours to two day sessions. Teaching a five hour session during the school day to a group of tired people takes real talent. As one professor noted: "You almost have to be charismatic!" Courses in Greenville were scheduled in a variety of formats at a variety of times. The only time viewed uniformly as unacceptable was Friday afternoons.

As indicated above, field-based inservice instruction is no easy task. Some persons have the skills, energy and commitment which effective field-based instruction demands. Others do not. The quality of courses offered in Greenville, as perceived by participants, varied widely from a low "This was the last in a long line of insults in the name of course delivered by University faculty in Greenville," to a positive "Fantastic." Of 19 courses delivered, 11 were responded to favorable, three received mixed reviews and five negative. Few commonalities really existed between those courses that were reviewed negatively. Two courses were straight lecture, with no application of information and exams consisting of regurgitation of facts. The goals and expectations of a third course were nebulous and kept shifting constantly. Content was lacking in two courses and preparation by the instructor was nonexistent in one. Several of these courses provided no feedback to students, or nebulous ones at best, regarding strengths and deficiencies of exams or papers. One course was based on material the participants already knew.

13. Master of Education Program

A major goal of the Project was to "provide a model for a field-based inservice graduate program designed for rural areas." In practice, the graduate program at USM was simply transferred to Greenville, with identical requirements for both interns and teachers. Nothing new was designed specific to rural areas, for either teachers or interns. Credits were equated only with courses, with the exceptions of the curriculum institute, adult education internship and LD practicum, and some of the work that was indeed "job related and needs responsive" was not considered worthy of credit.

Rather than using Greenville as an arena for designing and field testing needs responsive graduate programs for interns and for teachers that are unique to isolated regions, the traditional model of teacher education prevailed.

As the Dean of Education at UMF noted: "The program is designed to fulfill University fantasies - it isn't designed to meet local needs. It is designed to give people a degree for salary purposes and seems to have little relevance to the life of a classroom teacher." The Teacher Corps Project also coincided with a general tightening of program expectations at USM.

The program that was delivered was field-based in that courses were taught in Greenville, needs responsive only to the extent that individual professors were, and was generally mediocre at best. To start, coordination between the Teacher Corps, UMF and USM was poor, compounded by the fact that UMF was not the degree granting institution. Conflicting reports were heard from various staff of the three groups

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

13. Master of Education Program - continued

and the coordinators at UMF and USM were rarely in contact with each other. Negotiations were slow in getting off the ground and program expectations and options were never really clearly defined to teachers or interns. Due to a late start, scheduling of courses on top of a full teaching load was difficult. Courses were offered piecemeal, as faculty were available. Throughout the negotiation process, the Teacher Corps Director (I) was pushing for a less rigidly defined concentration within the context of the Project's three basic thrusts, seemingly with little success. The attempt, while laudable, only heightened uncertainty. Interns meanwhile were angry and felt they had signed on to the Project under false pretenses, having been told they could concentrate in an area of their choosing. Some teachers felt mislead, stating they were told that a variety of options would be available for areas of concentration.

A concentration in exceptionality excluded most subject specialists. Teachers were impatient throughout the fall with the drawn out procedures. Unanswered questions and false expectations got the program off to a less than rosy start. When courses did come to Greenville, however, they came in abundance, with a total of 36 graduate credits being offered in Greenville over a period of 18 months. Teachers were loaded, taking up to three courses at one time on top of a full teaching load. The quantity led to problems.



It's difficult to take even one course on top of full time teaching, much less three. The quality of course work and/or teaching suffered. Four of five teachers in the program commented on how easy the program was. As stated earlier, they complained about how easy it was and yet pushed for "convenient" courses, meeting their wants. Originally, a completed master's program for inservice teachers was not considered within the scope of the Project, however, courses kept coming and teachers kept taking them in order to complete the degree.

The handling of the comprehensive exams, described earlier, was sloppy and served as a disappointing finale to an intense, exciting as well as frustrating two year involvement in a Master of Education program.

14. Intern Program

Although the interns managed to amass an unusually comprehensive and valuable set of experiences, the program itself was a disappointment. They expected a planned, organized program integrating school and community and field/classroom experiences, designed in response to their interests as well as rural needs. Instead they received a traditionally and previously designed Master of Education program for inservice teachers that was delivered and coordinated in a piecemeal fashion. As the Greenville teachers, they expected it to be "job-embedded, problem-focused and site specific." In reality, the program was site specific only in that courses were taught in Greenville and problem-focused only to the extent that individual professors were.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

14. Intern Program - continued

Field experiences were not integrated into the program design - requirements consisted of courses, with few exceptions. Many of the experiences cited as most valuable by interns had nothing to do with program requirements and/or UMF. The interns had high expectations of professors and expected them to be knowledgeable, well prepared, and able to translate theory into practice. Many were not and did not. They were also overloaded with both undergraduate and graduate courses which were delivered in an inefficient sequence due to lack of prior planning.

A system providing ongoing support/feedback/evaluation from persons involved with the interns was not established, particularly regarding community work. The sloppy handling of the comprehensive exams, discussed earlier, was also cited by all interns as an unnecessary and unprofessional closure of the two year program.

15. Individualization Program

The individualization program was intended to respond to stated district needs and a Project thrust, that of basic skills instruction and alternate curriculum designs. As described earlier, this program fizzled out as coordination, assistance and follow up drooped. This was unfortunate as the original intent of linking UMF consultants with individual teachers was a potentially useful one and perceived as such, if services had been coordinated and followed up appropriately.



Such a breakdown was a disappointment to those teachers who had been involved and who had been told that such involvement would lead to six credits. These credits never materialized, although according to the coordinator at UMF they are on the books at UMF and could have been awarded. This program was also basically the extent of active, planned attempts by the Teacher Corps to meet individual teacher needs related to improvement in basic skills areas.

16. Inservice Efforts

A major objective of the inservice component of the Teacher Corps the second year of the Project, following the demise of the individualization program, was to "identify possible inservice services and resources, disseminate to teachers and deliver as appropriate." At this time, when curriculum committees were running smoothly, active linkages with content specialists and information about content in various curricular areas could have been useful and timely, and content/resources were identified by curriculum chairpersons as a major area of need.

Instead, the Teacher Corps stance was basically passive rather than active, quietly waiting for requests rather than creating requests. Granted, with SAD #2's strong sense of ownership in what happened, it was important not to step on toes and to be sensitive to school needs, but it is possible to be active and sensitive at the same time. The curriculum effort belonged to the school, not to Teacher Corps, however, a wealth of resources existed at UMF and elsewhere. It's unfortunate they were not utilized to the extent they might have been.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

17. Local Staff Development Process

The formation of a local staff development committee was an accomplishment. A weakness, however, was the time it took for its initiation and the lack of design and emplacement of a local staff development process or program by the close of the Project. It was talked about from the start of the Project, but not really acted on until the final spring. Even then, a staff development process was not institutionalized. Only time will tell whether or not enough support was built within the district to continue efforts initiated and to develop an ongoing program. Hopefully, it has been.

18. School/Community Linkages

Although one of the major accomplishments of the Project was the formation and emplacement of a school-community council in Greenville, planned short and long strategies for school/community linkages - a major Project goal - were limited throughout the Project. School and community persons tended to operate in isolation from one another and deliberate attempts to build channels of communication were slow in coming through the community component of the Project. School-community linkages were clearly not considered a priority by the Community Coordinator; instead, the focus of efforts - and success - lay in community education and the development of a sense of life control and a positive self-image in a small cadre of community persons.

As stated in May 1978, in the Year #2 proposal, "We have not spent enough time designing a more viable strategy of getting the community into the school. We need to work more closely with the school administrators on this issue," and "Nor are the members of the CEC 'interphasing' with school personnel as such, partially because we have not interested ourselves sufficiently in the school and also because it is so much more pleasant to deal with those community matters which we are all familiar with." Such comfortableness did not hasten a change in the status quo. Just as school people needed to become more aware of the community perspective - as community people contended - community people in turn, needed to become more aware of the school perspective. Some community people overlooked the fact that it's a two-way street.

The second year informal linkages increased somewhat though increased contact, and by the end of the year the stage was set for the melding of the PSC and CEC and the formation of the new school-community council, a planned process initiated by the Director.

19. Multicultural Component

Multicultural education, a component of all Teacher Corps Projects, was basically a wasteland throughout most of the Project. No Project staff person took ownership of this segment of the Project, although two staff had agreed to assume responsibility, and only as termination of the Project grew imminent, with prodding, were any services delivered. A series of seminars on multicultural education were offered in May and June through the community component of the Project. Much of the content focused around values and schooling.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

19. Multicultural Component - continued

It is unfortunate that only one teacher of seven participants was involved, as it could have served as an opportunity for school and community persons to discuss concerns pertinent to both groups. No follow up or carry-over was held due to the closure of the Project. That was it.

20. Lack of Institutional Support

Throughout the two year lifespan of the Project, active institutional support from both SAD #2 and UMF was lacking. The staffing pattern, of five aliens to UMF and three aliens to Greenville, contributed to this lack of support, along with strong personal and professional conflicts which few Project participants rose above. Although progress was made by the end of the Project and some linkages were developing, Project staff were not able to build a strong support base from key decision makers at UMF or SAD #2. Neither UMF nor SAD #2 took ownership of the Project. It (and its problems) belonged to the Project staff. Some persons were quick to criticize and yet took no action to do anything themselves to remedy the situation.

Words about innovative, less traditional programs were voiced and yet power (personal or position) was not exercised to break set traditions and expectations. The Teacher Corps Project was isolated from UMF and remained a separate entity in Greenville, even though all staff were based there, in the school. Even the name kept it separate.

University support of the UMF faculty involved in inservice efforts in Greenville was also lacking. The commitment was to preservice rather than inservice education. Many UMF faculty commented on feeling no administrative support whatsoever - tangible or otherwise - for their efforts, in the form of money, release time or simply encouragement. It was demoralizing to some staff who were interested in inservice education and willing to work an overload on top of an already existing overload, in addition to driving 92 long and bumpy miles strewn with obstacles as moose, deer, flooded streams, snow drifts and icey hills. Beautiful, perhaps, but tough driving.

Universities are typically accused of being "ivory towers" and far removed from the realities of school systems. Such realities must be understood if teacher educators are to truly link theory with practice and realistically assist pre and inservice teachers towards the ideals of education. As a UMF professor stated, "It is essential - if not crucial- for a teacher trainer to be engaged in continual field work for the sake of giving prospective teachers a taste of real world experiences." Inservice involvement can serve as a tool for furthering the professional development of IHE as well as local school faculty. Field work prods faculty to rethink their own work as educators and to reevaluate the relevance of their work to school systems today. It is also hard work, often frustrating and often not as successful as one would like. Dealing with real teachers in real classrooms is far removed from teaching inexperienced undergraduates in the safety of a University classroom. Strong University support is needed for such efforts. Support was not evident at UMF.

E. PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

21. Evaluation

Data regarding the attitudes and competencies of Project participants at the start and at the close of the Project was not collected, in part due to lack of definition of objectives to start (It's difficult to know what data to collect if objectives are not known,) and in part due to an absence of a long range evaluation design. Although data gathered suggests that some persons involved in the Project were indeed impacted by the Project - some profoundly so - hard data to support such conclusions is limited, which is unfortunate considering the monies spent throughout the Project. Such evaluative data could give more credence to changes that did take place, as well as highlighting those that did not.

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

Although the UMF/Greenville Teacher Corps Project had its difficult moments, a wealth of services and materials - previously non-existent - were provided for Greenville people within the lifespan of the Project and the lives of some Greenville people, as well as UMF faculty, impacted, some profoundly so. A review of Project accomplishments/impact follows.

1. Greenville-Community

A major intent of the community component of the Teacher Corps Project was community involvement and all services provided were purposefully used as tools for involvement. The PSC, the CEC, the needs assessment, the literacy program, courses and workshops - all served this end, to involve people. Such activities provided opportunities for people to voice opinions, to become meaningfully involved and to gain skills, leading to improved self-image and sense of life control.

The PSC and CEC in particular, provided ongoing, meaningful roles for a small group of community persons who gained leadership and communication skills as well as self-confidence. As one community person noted:

> "They have brought people out of the woodwork to work as a group and help the community. It has brought some people out who would never have come out before. If you helped one person out of a hundred to come out of the closet it has been a success."

Services provided or designed through the Teacher Corps Project for Greenville people are reviewed below, followed by specific examples of the impact of the Project on community persons.

- Greenville is now on the map in the minds of many persons previously unaware of its existence. During the lifespan of the Project linkages with over 25 agencies/institutions in and out of Maine were initiated and approximately 50 outside consultants were directly involved with Greenville people, including 13 from UMF. The channels of communication were opened. Hopefully some linkages will continue.

- Services delivered in Greenville, previously non-existent, included:

  - 18 workshops/seminars on a wide variety of topics from "Children's Literature" to Constructive Argument."

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

- Services delivered in Greenville, previously non-existent - (continued)

  - Four series of workshops/seminars on literacy training, multicultural education, nutrition and interpersonal communication

  - Four three-credit undergraduate courses

- Opportunities for involvement and information were also provided through the Human Services Fair, which helped inform local people of locally available services, and the Rural Education Conference which provided opportunities for new information and discussion about rural education.

- In addition to services available in Greenville, 13 community people attended eight conferences elsewhere in the country and several persons gave presentations at these conferences. Such involvement provided opportunities for travel, meeting new people, gaining new information, skills and self-confidence.

- A major and visible accomplishment of the Project was the formation and institutionalization of the School-Community Council. The foundation of community and school involvement was slowly built throughout the Project as a result of community involvement in Teacher Corps activities and dialogue between school and community persons. A School-Community policy statement was also approved by the school board.

- As a result of the efforts of the family planning committee (a sub-committee of the Teacher Corps CEC) a family planning policy was adopted by the school board.



- Several community persons were trained as literacy trainers and have been working with six clients who are, as intended, learning to read! Such work will continue.

- Three grants were written, totaling $51,000. Although only one $1,000 grant was actually awarded, skills were gained by those community persons involved in writing the proposals.

- Through the Teacher Corps information potentially useful to Greenville people was compiled, reported and left in Greenville. Both the Resource Catalog and the Parent Guide for Teacher Conferences may be used by both school and community persons and the Community Needs Assessment provides a rich source of demographic information about Greenville.

- One of the greatest accomplishments - if not the greatest accomplishment - of the Teacher Corps Project was its impact on some community people. Many people involved in services provided by the Teacher Corps gained understanding of themselves, of others, and of new information. Behaviors as well as attitudes of some Greenville people were changed as a result of the Project. The following statements were made by community people regarding the impact the Project had on them:

  "I found I'm not quite as stupid as I thought. I learned about my own potential. The Teacher Corps was a place to shine."

  "I learned that I am a person, that I am me. I'm more sure of myself - that I'm as good as they are. I'm not afraid of educators. It has made me feel better about myself."

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT -(continued)

"I just know that if anything happened to my husband, I can take care of myself and do something other than waiting on tables or washing dishes."

"I just like me a lot better. People like the Dean, Ross, Len, Steve are not one bit smarter than I am."

"I can accept federal programs."

"I earned that in spite of public opinions t[illegible]e are a lot of good cautious people trying to improve the quality of education."

"I have learned that we can waste a lot of money, but also that we can do some good things with it."

"Dollars spent do not necessarily improve education."

"Greenville is unique in its closeness."

"The impact of the Project on me has been one of learning, growth and perhaps the word would be sophistication. I have had to learn a great many things about communication, group process and tolerance. I have gained knowledge of the existence of my skills. The Project has given me direction."

"I am graduating because of the Teacher Corps. By working with the Deans and the PSC, I decided it was time to get a diploma."

"The Teacher Corps gave you the opportunity to verbalize coherently."



People also commented about specific things they had learned from workshops or courses:

"That enthusiasm can be drummed up for literature."

"That the boob tube must be shut off to force kids and adults back to reading."

"expectations of childrens' learning abilities."

"I have learned about many fun ways to teach your children to learn at home with every day simple objects."

"A better way to explain to my children what math really is."

"Some ideas on incorporating math into the every-day life of kids."

"That parents are important in helping making decisions in the community."

"The power parents can have over the school board."

"I learned how much pushing together means and that parents have to fight for their beliefs and work harder with all our school educators."

"That everybody has to work together."

"of the openness of the administration to parent/school participation. Nice tactics to get people involved."

"how strongly 'multiculturally related' almost all aspects of life are, whether dealing with schools, business, churches, etc."

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT - (continued

"how to keep my defenses down."

"My fears and many of my feelings were shared by almost all participants. It didn't seem to matter how much or how little education we have, we all feel threatened or intimidated in some manner at some time."

"how to plan a nutritious meal for a group, taking into consideration cost of food, availability, likes and dislikes of group being served."

Observations were made and specific examples cited by many community persons as evidence of new experiences, changes and growth resulting from the Teacher Corps Project:

"More town involvement in town meetings."

-a cook talking about going to Orono for further training

-calling Ross, Ross and then finding out he was the dean of education - but sitting there talking with him 1 to 1"

-seeing a community person saying to the superintendent, "I don't understand what you are saying."

-a person gaining self-confidence-taking on a car dealer who was not being fair

-a person who went to a conference in Boston, at the start saying how good it would feel to be home in her own kitchen and at the end saying she could go back and take over!

-a first plane flight



-a first meeting of a Jewish family

-a first meeting with black people

-a person learning to read a true story magazine

-four persons showing up at school board meetings, who never before went

-special education parents coming into the schools to talk to special education staff about their kids

-a person taking a course in Greenville now and feeling confident of going to UMF

-several persons taking leadership roles and talking to other groups in and out of Greenville about drug and alcohol programs, and/or community involvement

-parents becoming aware that they can see school records.

As indicated by the above comments, some community persons were deeply and profoundly impacted by the Teacher Corps Project. The Project touched others more lightly but still resulted in increased awareness, understanding and initiation of new skills.

2. Greenville-Schools (SAD #2)

A plethora of tangible services and materials were made available to Greenville school personnel through the Teacher Corps Project, and served as catalysts for growth for many Greenville teachers. As one SAD #2 staff person commented, the Project "rekindled a quest for learning for some," and "brought Greenville out of its isolation." Staff were exposed to people, information, and materials previously unknown to them. One person noted that "Even hating

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

2. Greenville-Schools (SAD #2)(continued)

the Teacher Corps made some blood run!" By the close of the Project:

- A Master of Education program in exceptionality was delivered in Greenville.
- Eleven three-credit graduate courses were delivered in Greenville.
- Three one-credit mini-courses were delivered in Greenville.
- Four mini-courses (recertification credits) were offered in Greenville
- Twenty-six outside consultants, including:
  - 17 UMF faculty from six departments (including the dean of education)
  - Three USM faculty
  - Two UMO faculty
  - One State Department of Education consultant
  - Three others

  provided direct services to SAD #2 staff in Greenville, in addition to:
  - 15 additional consultants from 11 additional organizations who made presentations at the Rural Education Conference
  - 21 workshops were offered in Greenville to SAD #2 staff
  - Six visitations by school faculty were made to other schools/organizations
  - 24 conferences out of Greenville were attended by 17 (of 44) SAD #2 faculty.
  - $9,675 worth of instructional supplies for SAD #2 was purchased
  - $7,033 worth of equipment for SAD #2 was purchased.

All but five (of 44) SAD #2 faculty (four secondary, one administrator) were involved in Teacher Corps services one way or another and most gained new information and skills, as well as awareness. The extent of school personnel involvement in Teacher Corps services is reviewed below. (Refer to pg.139,Chart B for specific review of involvement) Of 46 SAD #2 staff:

- 29 staff took one or more courses(including
- 11 staff took one course mini-courses)
- 5 staff took two courses
- 4 staff took three courses
- 7 staff took five or more courses
- 17 staff took no courses (eight secondary, four K-12 specialists, four elementary, one administrator)
- 26 staff attended conferences/visitations
- 18 staff were assisted by interns
- 27 staff utilized services of outside consultants
- 5 staff were uninvolved in Teacher Corps services
- 4 elementary teachers successfully completed an M. Ed. program and several others received special education certification.

Many school staff commented on observing real changes in other teachers who were now more "questioning and thinking," "open to changes," "assertive" and "seeking resources," and 31 of 45 staff identified specific things they were doing differently, or improvements in teaching as a result of Teacher Corps services.

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

2. Greenville-Schools (SAD #2) (continued)

These changes - cited in personal interviews conducted at the close of the Project - are reviewed below:

- use of behavior mod/learning centers
- using contingency models/developed a battery of tests for diagnosing reading
- restructured reading groups
- filing system in reading
- special education filing/behavior mod. ("I'm now a believer!")
- use of media center
- individualized math program
- set up reporting system and testing system
- "I was negative - I'm now trying to be more positive with students!"
- started a gifted program/have learned different ways to look at kids - don't jump to conclusions/using behavior mod (before totallynagainst.)
- now doing contracts with gifted children
- using more learning centers
- I'm able to test more easily
- use of media center/getting community people into class/setting up the class differently
- use poetry kits/values clarifications materials/ hooking up students with community persons
- using calculators
- using laminating machine
- ordered high interest - low reading books/ realize all staff must be involved in IEP's - more understanding of IEP, organizing differently
- looking at curriculum differently
- how to use personna/gave me more empathy for students/worked on Foxfire
- more independent work for students/getting keyed a bit more with special education
- more hands on materials
- designing a media center
- helped me organize my class better/helped me clarify goals
- senior physical education program/how to cook Chinese food
- how to plan specifically/practical ideas in outdoor education/ideas in phsyical educatio:
- ideas for outdoor education/using audio-visual/ have become more structured.

Many persons involved in the Project cited instructional materials left in Greenville as the greatest accomplishment of the Project. Materials purchased by the Teacher Corps included:

- a social studies program
- an elementary science program
- an elementary French program
- math kits and materials
- six calculators
- reading kits

The social studies, science and French programs and calculators were also integrated into the school curriculum.

Equipment purchased by the Teacher Corps and left in Greenville included tables, chairs, office equipment as files and typewriter, and supplies for the media center.

One of the most visible accomplishments and contributions of the Teacher Corps was the Media Center.

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

2. Greenville-Schools (SAD #2) (continued)

Through the direction of a UMF consultant, a center was designed, constructed and supplied and inservice assistance provided to the librarian in particular and other SAD #2 teachers regarding use of machinery and tools.

Exceptionality was a major thrust of the Project and services to improve mainstreaming skills of teachers, procedures and materials were carefully designed and implemented throughout the Project. Specific outcomes in four areas of need which were identified at the start of the Project are described below:

Motor Development

- Design and field testing of a gross motor skills screening instrument
- Motor screening of students K-6
- Design and implementation of an alternative curriculum for high school senior physical education classes
- Institutionalization of screening process via PET team
- Involvement of physical education staff in PET process
- Establishment of grade level objectives and activities for physical education classes
- Development of process to create alternative curriculum for handicapped children
- Refinement of junior and senior high program offerings, particularly in the area of life time activities and use of local recreational resources
- Facilities and equipment for instruction in fine and gross motor skills.

Special Education Management

- Review of filing and recording systems
- Refined IEP process
- 94-142 compliance
- Refined PET procedures

Speech and Hearing

- Design of speech and language screening instrument
- Writing of an organizational handbook describing the SAD #2 program, including referral and testing procedures. (This procedure was also adopted by the Penquis area speech therapist.)
- Clarification of roles and responsibilities of assistant principal, special education director, as related to the PET process and pupil special services
- Design of a program using CUED speech strategy for a child in a regular classroom
- Establishment of local speech therapist in inservice role.

Gifted and Talented

- Increased awareness of gifted children's needs
- Development of teacher initiated nomination process for gifted and talented
- Institutionalization of GIFT Team in formal committee structure to continue effort in developing instructional programs for gifted students
- Changes in PET procedure to deal with gifted students as well as students with "remedial" needs and "special" needs, and the formation of a Child Study Team in SAD #2 to handle such specific cases.
- $600 of instructional materials.

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

2. Greenville-Schools (SAD #2) (continued

Although the curriculum development process was directed by the SAD #2 administration, the Teacher Corps played a major role in the development and implementation of the process, through a) provision of monies to support identified needs, b) stipends to chairpersons and c) personnel (Team Leader II) to assist the committees and the assistant principal. The extent of development is questionable had Teacher Corps support not been available. The practice of supporting chairperson involvement with the committees through stipends was adopted and institutionalized by the school board for the upcoming year.

Additional accomplishments/evidence of impact of the Teacher Corps include:

- Successful completion of a Master of Education program with a concentration in exceptionality, by four elementary teachers
- Award of certification in special education to several other teachers
- The formation of a local staff development committee and the initiation of a local staff development program. Hopefully, this committee will continue to operate in the upcoming year and actually emplace a process for local staff development.

As indicated by the information described above, the Teacher Corps Project had a real impact on the local school district and accomplishments of the Project are evident.

3. University of Maine at Farmington

A major goal of the Teacher Corps Project was the design and delivery of inservice programs/activities in Greenville, including a Master of Education program. Although the quality of services delivered varied, coordination was less than smooth and the quality as well as quantity of the Master of Education program was questionable, the fact that services were actually delivered by University personnel - including three Deans - in Greenville, 92 miles away, was an accomplishment. A majority of courses delivered were responded to favorably and some faculty successfully translated theory into practice and delivered courses that were responsive to local needs as well as program needs.

Field work in Greenville proved to be learning experience for most UMF and other IHE faculty. Such involvement directly with Greenville people led to a heightened awareness and understanding of teaching, education, the realities of school systems and rural communities. The following observations/insights/learnings were voiced by several University faculty working in the schools at the close of the first year of the Project:

- "It is essential - if not crucial - for a teacher trainee to be engaged in continual field work for the sake of giving prospective teachers a taste of real world experiences."

- "A consultant's objectives and outcomes can (should) change radically due to the needs and wants that surface in a 'real world' educational context."

- "A consultant must function in two ways: satisfy immediate needs and requests and raise the consciousness of the classroom teachers being served concerning long-range plans and comprehensive programs."

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACTS

3. University of Maine/Farmington(continued)

- "To provoke teachers to recognize the difference between a want and a need is sometimes a frustrating task."
- "Only when thinking about specific school contexts (geographic, demographic and otherwise) can a consultant develop overall programs and specific methods for particular teachers."
- "For any true change to take place, a sense of trust and camaraderie must be established between a classroom teacher and a consultant."
- "Classroom teachers can tell us an awful lot about the psychology of the learner and how contemporary students interact within a given context."
- "Classroom teachers are reality-based; University instructors tend toward the ideal if not the improbable."
- "Communication between University educators and field teachers must be a continual process for the sake of survival and maximum operation. We can both pride ourselves on having something of value to offer each other."
- "Working with special educators has shown me that teachers work very hard and keep their spirit high despite chronic overloading, lack of appropriate resources and ever-increasing demands put on them by new legal requirements. Their positive attitudes and high level motivation constantly amaze me."
- "I've been impressed again that it is difficult to change an established system. It's easy to identify needs but producing changes is very difficult. Talking about what needs to be done is much easier than doing it."
- "Be accepting of what teachers are already doing, whether it be relying heavily on a text, supplementing with handouts, or teaching with 'hands on' experiences."
- "Use what teachers are already doing as a basis for change. Rarely will a teacher argue against the need for improvement."
- "Throughout, smile, listen, appreciate and show a genuine interest in what the teachers are doing and trying to do. In short, be a professional."

And at the close of the Project, comments were made by IHE faculty working with Greenville teachers and community people:

- "I'm convinced that what the community will not tolerate, the schools will not do - it is imperative to be sensitive to the communities wishes."
- "It is impossible to service remote areas within present resources, in the traditional way. It can't be done on an overload."
- "Innovative programs are frequently frustrating."
- "I found out that it is possible to transport ideas 100 miles. It worked particularly well in the summer."
- "I would probably structure the course a bit more if I did it over. I found people there resource starved."
- "I found that I really enjoy teaching!"
- " I've learned that you can get a lot out of a faculty when you put them in the field."
- "I've learned that it is possible, even with difficulties, for the University to participate in community renewal."
- "Citizen involvement is the key to implementation."

F. ACCOMPLISHMENTS/IMPACT

3. University of Maine/Farmington (continued)

- "The Project forced me to extend myself into the community."
- "For the first time I wasn't in a lecture hall - and found myself really involved with people."
- "I made my stuff more portable."
- "The Project reinforced the understanding that outside money, if directed in the right spot, with proper guidance and direction, can result in things that would otherwise take years and years."
- "Professors in the field have to work a hell of a lot harder than students."
- "The pressure is constant from students in inservice courses to reduce the quality."
- "You can't be hung up on the quarters when you teach."

A minor, and yet according to some, the only notable structural impact the Teacher Corps had on UMF was the institutionalization of the policy that half of the overhead monies from federal grants goes directly to the Dean of the division receiving the grant. (In previous years, the monies went directly to main office administration.) The overhead monies provided by the Project were used to buy materials and support UMF staff travel to professional conferences.

Teacher Corps monies also supported nine UMF faculty participating in fifteen conferences throughout the United States.

In addition to the institutionalization of a policy regarding overhead monies, Teacher Corps monies supported the emplacement of a graduate program through UMF. Such a plan had been in the works but it was the Teacher Corps Project that actually put it into effect. Now that it is there it is likely to continue, at least for a while. The program also brought attention to the need for clean and clear coordination between UMF and USM if such efforts are to continue.

The Teacher Corps supported the continued development and field testing of minicourses - "The best concept in teacher education in a long time." - through the provision of monies to support personnel assisting in the development and to purchase necessary services, materials. As a direct result of the minicourse project - and a major accomplishment - six new minicourses were written (and thus potentially replicable,) five were field tested by University and local staff and five local persons were trained to teach a minicourse. The written minicourses now belong to UMF. Teacher Corps monies supported the publication of six of these minis which now belong to UMF and can continue to be replicated throughout Maine. The minicourses were approved for CEU credit and have been endorsed by the Dean of Education and the Dean of Public Services at UMF. Plans for ongoing use and development of minicourses have been made.

The seemingly immutable University system did allow room for negotiation of undergraduate course requirements for a major in adult education including credit for an internship. A minor but significant indication that perhaps the University does occasionally allow room for adaptations.

CHART B - SCHOOL PERSONNEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE TEACHER CORPS

| TEACHER | COURSES | CONSULTANTS | CONFERENCES/ VISITATIONS | INTERNS | OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 1 (A) | Media | Social Studies | End of Year Natural Science Program | #1 | |
| Grade 1 (B) | Mini-courses<br>Media<br>T & M<br>EEC<br>Research<br>Philosophy<br>Psych. of Adult Learner<br>Analysis<br>Reading Remediation<br>Pract. in Exceptionality | Gifted | Rural Education Conference | #1 | |
| Grade 2 (A) | Mini-courses<br>Media<br>Analysis<br>Philosophy<br>Research<br>EEC<br>Curriculum Institute | Math<br>Gifted<br>Language Arts | Washington National Conference-'78<br>Gifted Conf./Atlanta<br>Science Curriculum<br>Rural Ed. Conf. | #1<br>#3<br>#4 | Gifted Committee<br>Community Needs Assessment<br>Team Leader and Field-Based Instructor |
| Grade 2 (B) | 1 Mini-course | | ECRI Visitation | | |
| Kindergarten | 1 mini-course | | Rural Ed. Conf. | | Field-Based Instructor |
| Grade 3 (A) | | Gifted | Children's Literature | #1 | Community Needs Assessment |

| TEACHER | COURSES | CONSULTANTS | CONFERENCES/ VISITATIONS | INTERNS | OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 (B) | | | Children's Literature | | |
| Grade 4 (A) | EEC<br>Supervision<br>Mini-courses<br>Test & Measurements | Math<br>Science<br>Speech<br>Gifted | Rural Ed. Conf.<br>Social Studies-Boston<br>AACTE-Chicago<br>Teacher Center-Searsport<br>Gifted Conf.-Atlantic City<br>End of Year-Network | | Gifted Committee<br>P.S.C. member<br>Curriculum Coordinator<br>Resource Center |
| Grade 4 (B) | Tests & Measurements<br>Analysis<br>Reading Rem.<br>Philosophy<br>Supervision<br>Research<br>Media<br>Curr.Inst.<br>Mini-courses<br>Practicum in Exceptionality | Motor<br>Speech<br>Science<br>Gifted | Social Studies-Boston<br>Science Visitation<br>Rural Ed. Conference | #1 | Field Based Instructor, Team Leader, Director |
| Grade 4 (C) | Reading Rem.<br>Mini-course | | | | Director, Field Based Instructor |
| Grade 5 (A) | | Motor<br>Language Arts<br>Math | | | |
| Grade 5 (B) | Mini-courses<br>Pract.in Excep.<br>Rem.Reading<br>Philosophy<br>EEC & T.& M.<br>Curr.Inst.<br>Research | Math<br>Gifted<br>Science | Year End Conf.Network<br>Multi-cultural Conf.<br>Rural Ed. Conf.<br>CUED Speech Conf. | #3 | Director, Field-Based Instructor |

| TEACHER | COURSES | CONSULTANTS | CONFERENCES/ VISITATIONS | INTERNS | OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 6 (A) | Curriculum Inst. Supervision | Math<br>Science<br>Social Studies | Rural Ed. Conference | #4 | Director |
| Grade 6 (B) | Psychology of the Adult Learner | | Social Studies-Boston<br>Gifted Conf.-Atlanta<br>French Program-Potsdam,N.Y. | <br><br>#4 | Curriculum Chairpeople<br>Gifted Committee |
| Shirley School | | Language Arts | | #3<br>#4 | |
| Junior H. Math | Curriculum Institute | Math | Individualization Conference-Bangor | | |
| Junior H. Reading | Curriculum Institute | Language Arts<br>Reading | ECRI Visitation<br>Readfield Jr.High | #3 | Gifted Committee<br>Curriculum Chairpeople |
| Junior H. Science | | | | | |
| Junior H. Soc.Std. | | | | | |
| H.S. Science | | | | | |
| H.S. Science | Curriculum Institute | Science | Rural Education Conf. | | Curriculum Committee-Team Leader-Community Coordinator |
| Business | | | Rural Education Conf. | | |
| Social Studies | Test & Measurements | Social Studies | Multi-cultural Conf.<br>N.E.Soc.Std.-Boston | #2 | Community Ed.Committee |
| Math | Test & Measurements-Supervision-Curr.Inst. | Math | Program Evaluation Seminar | | Curriculum Chairperson |

| TEACHER | COURSES | CONSULTANTS | CONFERENCES/ VISITATIONS | INTERNS | OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math | | | | | PDS-Calculator Curr. |
| English | | Language Arts | National Council Teachers of English-Chicago | #2<br>#3 | Team Leader-Field-Based Instructor |
| French | | | Rural Education Conf. | | Community Survey |
| Remedial | Social Studies Methods<br>Reading Methods<br>Science "<br>Reading Rem.<br>Curr.Inst.<br>Rural Soc.<br>Dev.Psych.<br>T. & M.<br>Psych.of Adult Learner | Motor<br>Reading<br>Math<br>Science | UMF-Childrens'Lit. | #1<br>#4 | Gifted Committee<br>Community Coordinator<br>Field-Based Instruc.<br>Director |
| Special Ed. | Philosophy<br>Media<br>Analysis<br>T.& M.<br>Research<br>Practicum<br>Mini-courses<br>Curr.Inst. | Motor<br>Speech<br>Sp.Ed.Mgmt.<br>Science<br>Reading<br>Math<br>Gifted | Wash.Conf.-'77<br>Teacher Center-Searsport<br>Network-Exceptional Child-Boston & Concord | #1<br>#4 | Gifted Committee<br>L.S.D.P.<br>Field-Based Instruc.<br>Director<br>Community Coordinator<br>Curriculum Chairperson |
| Rem.Rdg.<br>Title I | | | UMF-Children's Lit. | | |
| Sec.Sp.Ed. | Mini-Courses | Language Art<br>Math<br>Instr.Design<br>Motor | Rural Education Conf. | #1<br>#2<br>#4 | Field-Based Instruc.<br>Director |
| Ind.Arts | Trends In Voc.Ed.<br>Curr.Inst. | | Program Evaluation Conf. Biddeford<br>Rural Education Conf. | | Curriculum Chairpeople<br>P.S.C. |
| Home Ec. | Curr.Inst.<br>Mini-Courses | | Rural Education Conf. | #1,3 | Field-Based Instruc. |

| TEACHER | COURSES | CONSULTANTS | CONFERENCES/ VISITATION | INTERNS | OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Art | | Gifted | Rural Education Conf. | | Field-Based Instruc. |
| Phys.Ed. | | Motor | UMF Visitation<br>Rural Conference | | Field-Based Instruc.<br>Director #2 |
| Phys.Ed. | | Motor | UMF Visitation | | Field-Based Instruc.<br>P.D.S.<br>Director #2 |
| Music | Analysis of Teaching<br>Curriculum Inst.<br>Media | | | | |
| Library | Media<br>Exceptional Child Curr.Inst. | Media | Rural Ed. Conf.<br>Children's Lit.-UMF<br>Human Services | | |
| Guidance | Trends in Voc.Ed.<br>Curr.Inst. | | Gifted Conf-Boston<br>Family Planning-Bangor<br>Financial Aid-Boston<br>Westinghouse Scheduling-Portland<br>Profession Guidance-Portland<br>Group Leadership-Bangor | | Gifted Committee<br>Instructor for English/ Interpersonal Communications |
| Principal | Supervision | Leadership Training<br>Math | Westinghouse Scheduling-Portland<br>Institutionalization-Boston<br>Management-Network-Hyannis<br>Washington National -'77,'78<br>Science Curr.Visitation<br>Principal's Conf.Network-Boston | | P.S.C.<br>Instructor-Curr.Inst. |

| TEACHER | COURSES | CONSULTANTS | CONFERENCES/ VISITATIONS | INTERNS | OTHERS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assistant Principal | Supervision | Leadership Training Gifted | Ass't. Princ.Conf.-N.Y.<br>Washington National- '78<br>French Curr.Visitation<br>J.H. program-visit-Readfield | | Instructor/Curr. Inst.<br>Mini-course Instr.<br>Gift Team-Coordinator |
| Voc.Ed. Director | Trends in Voc.Ed. | Vocational Ed. | Rural Education Conf.<br>Program Evaluation-Biddeford | #3 | P.S.C.<br>Instructor/Curr.Inst. |
| Superintendent | | | | | |

IV. ORIGINAL PROPOSAL AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

The outcomes of the UMF/SAD #2 Teacher Corps Project, as related to original proposed goals are briefly summarized and reviewed in the following chart.

| PROPOSED GOALS/OUTCOMES | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| Major Project Goals: | |
| 1. To provide the University of Maine at Farmington with an opportunity to develop, implement and evaluate a replicable, field-based graduate education model in elementary and secondary education that is responsive to needs identified by local schools and communities and is specifically directed towards regions that have limited access to universities and related supportive facilities. | 1. U.S.M.'s Master of Education program was delivered in Greenville to five elementary teachers and four interns. The program was responsive to University program needs, rather than local, rural needs and was field-based only that it was taught in Greenville. The program is replicable only if monies are to be had to pay professors to deliver on site. |
| 2. To facilitate linkages among departments and individuals at the University of Maine at Farmington that will allow the University to be increasingly responsive to pre and inservice training needs of teachers of rural disadvantaged children in Maine. | 2. The only linkage among departments was the collaborative support between the Division of Public Services and the Division of Education regarding the continued utilization of replicable minicourses which had been developed. |
| 3. To develop and implement a preservice program preparing four interns for work in rural communities with high concentrations of disadvantaged children and limited access to supportive services and training facilities. | 3. Four interns successfully completed the same Master of Education program as SAD #2 teachers. It was not preservice specific nor site specific. One intern managed to shape a program in line with both his needs/interests and rural needs. |
| 4. To develop and implement a graduate level inservice program for teachers of rural disadvantaged youth, in SAD #2, which is exportable to other regions with limited access to University and related supportive facilities. | 4. The Master of Education program is exportable only if monies can be found to support University faculty in the field. |

| PROPOSED GOALS/OUTCOMES (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 5. To provide pre and inservice teachers in Greenville with training to develop competencies in the areas of (a) diagnostic/prescriptive teaching of basic skills, (b) alternative organizational and curriculum designs, and (c) mainstreaming in the regular classroom (exceptionality.) | a) Four interns took methods courses in reading, math, science and social studies and three interns and five teachers participated in a remedial reading course. Through the short lived individualization program over 19 SAD #2 teachers worked with content specialists from UMF in math, science, social studies, language arts. Through the SAD #2 curriculum process, supported by Teacher Corps monies, teachers in science, language arts, math and social studies committees were familiarized with different materials and approaches, resulting in the selection and adoption of science, social studies programs, calculators. A media center was also constructed to assist teachers and seven teachers participated in a Media course.<br><br>b) Planned services to meet this thrust were limited, although related to services in the other two thrusts. The junior high school effort never got off the ground and the multicultural program was limited to one series of seminars offered at the close of the Project.<br><br>c) Thirteen of 44 teachers participated in one or more of seven courses or minicourses in exceptionality which were delivered in Greenville as a part of the Master of Education requirements. Four elementary teachers and three interns were awarded M.Ed. degrees in exceptionality. Thirteen teachers were also assisted by consultants in four areas of special needs identified through the exceptionality program. |

| PROPOSED GOALS/OUTCOMES (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 6. To facilitate increased interaction between the school and the community for collaborative decision making regarding (a) school problem solving in general, (b) inservice and preservice teacher education in particular, and (c) the installation of a community-based education design and to establish permanent linkage between the school and the community. | 6.(a) A school-community council was institutionalized in Greenville and a small cadre of community people involved in the PSC and CEC gained skills in problem solving/communication, etc.<br><br>(b) Persons on the PSC were informed of activities in pre and inservice components of the Project and were involved in decision making by approval or disapproval. They were not involved in the planning of services.<br><br>(c) Such a design was not installed. The school-community council was institutionalized. |
| 7. To develop and install a K-12 individualized instructional program designed to meet the needs of the students, the school system and the community at large. | SAD #2 curriculum committees are working to coordinate curriculum K-12, however, a K-12 individualized instructional program was not developed or installed. |
| 8. To provide the school and the community with necessary skills and resources which would allow the schools to develop and test a range of staff development models and put in place the model which best fits the needs of the students, the staff and the community. | 8. The SAD #2 curriculum development process - supported by the Teacher Corps - serves as a means of development and is now firmly rooted in SAD #2. A local staff development committee was also formed and a rough draft of a plan written. |
| **ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES** | **ACTUAL OUTCOMES** |
| 1. University<br>a. The University of Maine at Farmington in cooperation with the Greenville public schools will have trained at least four interns to assume teaching positions in rural areas with high concentration of disadvantaged children. | a. Four interns were trained. |

| ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 1. University<br>b. The University of Maine at Farmington in conjunction with the Greenville public schools will have provided field-based graduate level inservice training to at least 25 teachers in the areas of exceptionality, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of basic skills and alternative teaching strategies and approaches. | b. All but five SAD #2 teachers/specialists were involved in some way in services delivered relating to three Project thrusts. A consultant trainer model was not implemented. |
| c. A graduate level inservice training program for rural regions will have been developed and field tested. Such a program should be exportable to other rural regions with limited access to universities and related supportive facilities. | c. No such graduate program was developed or implemented. The USM M. Ed. program was simply transported to Greenville. Six inservice minicourses, which were exportable and replicable were written, field tested and published and ongoing utilization of them is planned. |
| d. Linkages among departments and individuals at the University of Maine at Farmington will have been established that will allow the University to be increasingly responsive to preservice and inservice training needs of teachers of rural disadvantaged children in Maine. | d. No linkages occurred outside of collaborative support by the Deans of Public Services and Education for continued minicourse use and development. |
| 2. School-Community<br>a. The Greenville public schools in conjunction with the community of Greenville will have established and placed in operation a steering committee adjunct to the local school board designed for collaborative decision making and hence to respond more directly to local school problem solving needs. | a. A school-community council was emplaced. |

| ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 2. School-Community | |
| b. The school program will have permanent linkages between the home and the community which will be aided by the teachers, interns and volunteers trained within the framework of the proposal. | b. Formal permanent linkages are limited to the School-Community Council. |
| c. The installation of a K-12 individualized instructional program personalized to meet the needs of the student, the school system and the at-large community of Greenville. | c. A K-12 individualized program was not designed or installed. |

| PROCEDURES FOR REACHING PROJECT GOALS | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 1. Needs Analysis | |
| a. Assessment of University resources | a. A planned assessment was not designed or implemented. University resources were assessed informally and unsystematically. |
| b. Assessment of inservice training needs and competencies in the three program thrusts, as perceived by SAD #2 classroom teachers, by school administrative personnel, by University personnel, and by local students and members of the community. | b. District needs were assessed through the SAD #2 self-evaluation process and the curriculum committees. Individual staff needs were assessed informally and unsystematically through a variety of means. Competencies in program thrusts were not assessed. |
| c. Assessment of needs in a rural setting which are related to field based preservice teacher education programs. | c. A planned preservice assessment was not designed or implemented. The interns were handed the same program as the teachers. |
| d. Assessment of needs in a rural setting which are related to community based education concerns and potential avenues of participation by the community at large. | d. Community needs were assessed informally and unsystematically. A community needs assessment was designed but it had no bearing on services delivered. |
| 2. Development and implementation of instructional programs | |
| a. Identification of learning and staff development objectives. Both interns and teachers will select teaching objectives, based on needs assessments. It is anticipated that some objectives will be individualized and others will involve groups of teachers. | a. Teaching objectives were not identified. |
| b. Instructional programs:<br>(1) School problem solving seminars and workshops<br>(2) Individual professional development<br>(3) Formal courses<br>(4) Minicourses | b.(1) Problem solving seminars were not held.<br>(2) Twenty six school faculty worked individually with consultants.<br>(3) Eleven three credit courses were offered.<br>(4) Five minicourses were offered in the Greenville area. |

| PROCEDURES FOR REACHING PROJECT GOALS | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 2.c. Establishment of a Teaching Center | c. A media center was constructed and a resource file containing curricular materials/ideas compiled. |
| d. Implementation of instructional alternatives for students. | d. The only services directly related to this objective were programs designed for several students with special needs. |
| **MANAGEMENT DESIGN** | |
| 1. The proposed management system is designed to manage a change process and provide for ongoing constituent role feedback, as well as decision influencing. It relies on an evaluation system designed to serve as a management tool providing data for ongoing shaping and reshaping of Project managment decisions. The management system is patterned after an MBO model, calling for identification of Project goals, target(s) for change, innovation(s), outcome(s), staffing assignments and resource allocations. | 1. An MBO model was not designed or implemented. The evaluation system was used as a management tool the second year of the Project. |
| 2. The proposed management structure is intended to provide for maximum collaboration among all constituent role groups in the decision making process. The structure contains the following key elements: | |
| a. The Project Steering Council will serve as the prime governance body for the Project. It is responsible for formulating the policies for operation of the Project and for coordinating the roles and functions of the University faculty, school district staff and community groups. The council is composed of representatives from the following groups: SAD #2 teachers, administrators, board of directors, the Maine Teachers Association, parents, community, the SDEC, UMF and the intern team. The Director of the Project is to serve as executive secretary for the committee. | 2.a. The Project Steering Council was formed and operated as designated. |

| MANAGEMENT DESIGN (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 2.b. In addition to the PSC, the following sub-committees composed of representatives from varying school and community groups, will serve primary functions in determining Project activities and directions: | |
| (1) The School-Community Council will oversee the entire Project, interact with community organizations and remain as an ongoing coordinating group following withdrawal of the Teacher Corps after the current funding period. Guidelines for membership of this council are still to be determined. | b.(1) The School-Community Council was formed at the close of the Project. |
| (2) The Committee on Community Education, composed of five community people, two teachers, two students, and one core faculty member, will be responsible for identifying community needs, recommending priorities, and developing programs and activities to meet these needs and priorities. | b.(2) The CEC was formed and operated as designated. |
| (3) The Committee on Inservice Teacher Education will be responsible for identifying needs and planning and developing all components of the inservice program subject to the approval of the PSC. | b.(3) The Inservice Committee was formed at the end of the first year of the Project to serve a reporting function to the PSC. It was soon dismantled, however, as it served no function. |
| (4) The Committee on Preservice Teacher Education will identify needs and plan and develop all components of the intern program subject to the approval of the PSC. Four cooperating teachers, four interns, one core faculty and two community persons will comprise this committee. | b.(4) The Preservice Committee was formed at the end of the first year of the Project to serve a reporting function to the PSC. It was soon dismantled as it served no real function. |

| MANAGEMENT DESIGN (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 3. Project Staffing | |
| a. The Project Director will be a member of the UMF faculty and will be responsible to the Dean of Education. The Director will be responsible for the over-all administration of the Project according to the policies established by the PSC, and will have teaching and/or administrative experience in public schools and higher education. | a. The founder of the Project and a member of the State Department of Education was hired as Project Director. |
| b. The Program Development Specialist will be a member of the UMF faculty and responsible to the Project Director for his/her assigned responsibilities. This person will have demonstrated competencies in the general area of inservice staff development and will have public school experience and in-on and off-campus teacher education. | b. A research specialist and professor at the University of New York/Potsdam was hired as PDS. |
| c. The Core Faculty will have expertise in one of three areas:<br>1. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of basic skills K-12<br>2. Alternative organizational and curriculum design K-12<br>3. Teaching of the exceptional child in the regular classroom K-12 and will qualify for both graduate and undergraduate faculty status. | c. A secondary English teacher in Cambridge, Mass., with some experience in staff development and knowledge of early childhood was hired as core faculty. |
| d. The Community Coordinator will be a member of the SAD #2 staff and appointed by the local school board. This person will be experienced in community education and/or community activities and will be reponsible to the local superintendent through the Project Director. | d. The editor of the Greenville paper was hired as Community Coordinator. |

| MANAGEMENT DESIGN (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| 3. Project Staffing | |
| e. The Team Leader will be a member of SAD #2 appointed by the local school board. The Team Leader will be responsible for the intern team and the on-site intern program and will have public school experience in curriculum development and inservice teacher education. | e. The assistant principal of SAD #2 was hired as Team Leader. |
| **EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION** | **ACTUAL OUTCOMES** |
| 1. Evaluation | |
| Evaluation for the purpose of the UMF/SAD #2 Teacher Corps Project is perceived as a mechanism to affect decision making about the usefulness and/or relevancy of what has been done. It will be our intention to utilize the evaluation process to accomplish three major goals: | |
| a. to find out what is effective and what is not effective about the Project;<br>b. to make judgments about the relevancy of the proposed Project in terms of the thrusts and processes;<br>c. to accumulate sufficient data which might lead to the reinforcement, modification, and/or refocusing of the proposed Project thrusts. | 1. The first year an outside part time consultant (20 days) was hired by the Director to provide ongoing feedback to staff regarding Project activities, effectiveness, and perceptions of participants (process evaluation.) Context and input evaluation were never really conducted, or if so, informally. Product evaluation was attempted but with limited success as context objectives had not been defined. The second year involvement of the consultant increased to half time and both process and product evaluation were conducted. |
| Four types of evaluation will be conducted: | |
| a. Context evaluation to define the specific environment, unmet needs and problems underlying these needs.<br>b. Input evaluation to identify and assess the relevant capabilities of the institution (UMF) that is implementing delivery strategies. | |

| EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION (continued) | ACTUAL OUTCOMES |
|---|---|
| c. Process evaluation to generate ongoing feedback to major Project developers, identifying strengths and weaknesses.<br>d. Product evaluation to relate outcomes to original objectives and determine effectiveness of activities. | |
| 2. Dissemination<br><br>Dissemination is defined as a skill-sharing and information-sharing process to communicate what the UMF/SAD #2 Teacher Corps Project has learned about inservice teacher training education in the training complex context to other LEA's in the state and educators regionally. | |
| a. Media dissemination | |
| (1) Monthly newsletters and press releases to state and regional publications | (1) Five Teacher Corps newsletters were written throughout the Project and disseminated statewide the first year and locally both years. |
| (2) Regular radio forums and TV panels through local commercial stations and the Maine Public Broadcasting Network. | (2) Radio forums and TV panels were not developed. A TV show was broadcast in the spring, 1978, on the Maine Public Broadcasting Network. |
| b. Dissemination through training and visitation<br><br>Eight core groups of "consultant trainers" from other rural school districts in Maine will be trained in Greenville and skilled in such areas as group problem solving, needs assessment, resource identification, community organization, communication, etc. These "trainers" will then return to their own communities and install their own training complex. | b. The training of "consultant trainers" was proposed by the Director (I) and then the core faculty, as related to a local staff development program, but was vetoed by the staff and PSC. However, six minicourses utilizing trainers' concepts were developed, published and disseminated in six locations in Maine. |

## V. LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The UMF/Greenville Teacher Corps Project closed, as it started, to mixed reviews. It was a difficult Project and a great deal of money was spent with limited visible impact. Nonetheless, the Teacher Corps Project clearly drew Greenville out of its isolation through an influx of new blood, assistance and numerous materials, as well as opportunities for travel outside of Greenville. Some people were deeply affected by the Project. Most persons who participated in the Project learned something, whether a skills, knowledge of materials or resources, or an insight into themselves.

This report closes with a brief presentation of learnings/observations gained through the Project and recommendations for persons involved in Teacher Corps or other change Projects involving diverse role groups.

1. Institutional Commitment

   Institutional commitment and support is central to effective change. Require demonstrable commitment to the project from the participating institutions/organizations prior to the start of the project. (Release time, financial compensation, written and verbal support serve as evidence of commitment.) If commitment isn't there, changes are unlikely to occur.

2. Title - Teacher Corps

   Teacher Corps connotes teachers and school to most people. If the project focuses on other groups/agencies than the schools, consider changing or downplaying the name.

3. Project Staffing

a. Staff the project with at least some accepted persons from the participating institutions/groups. Such persons know the informal and formal systems and are more likely to open doors. The Directorship in particular is key.

b. Carefully assess the culture/values of the environment and the skills and sensitivities of staff necessary to work within this framework. Hire and place staff accordingly. (i.e., some persons may function effectively in University settings but not in rural communities.) Proceed with sensitivity.

c. Carefully consider the makeup of the project staff and the advantages and disadvantages of a homogenious versus heterogeneous group, in line with project goals. Diversity is potentially a plus, but too much can splinter a staff and undermine the project.

4. Leadership needs

   Assess the leadership needs of the project staff throughout the project and adapt leadership styles to meet these needs. They are likely to vary from staff person to person and over time. Some persons function most effectively autonomously, others do not. Particularly at the start.

V. LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

5. Staff Team Building

Promote ongoing staff team building through occasional retreats and planned activities integrated into the ongoing maintenance of the project. A united front is important, open backbiting not only undermines individuals but the project as well. If staff don't support each other, how can others support them or the project? Personal and professional differences should be dealt with privately and if debilitating to the project, new staff should be hired.

6. Staff Support/Evaluation

Set up an ongoing support system for the project staff, including the Director, as well as a system of evaluation/accountability. Ongoing support, encouragement and assistance is needed, and yet expectations also need to be clear. The bottom line of dismissal for ineffective or inappropriate performance should not be overlooked, hidden or softened. It's a reality or should be.

7. Contact with Decision Makers

a. At the start identify key decision makers in all role groups, both with position and personal power, and schedule ongoing work sessions - concentrated to start - to involve as appropriate in project planning and implementation. Make efforts to involve the critics. Ongoing dialogue is central to success. Identify staff persons who can work with key personnel and sustain efforts to meet regularly (although not necessarily frequently) with those persons, in spite of conflicts which may arise, and to be appropriately visible. (i.e., some time in the bars may be appropriate if that's where local folks congregate, but too much time can lead to criticisms of unprofessional behavior and wasted dollars.)

b. Design an ongoing road map depicting the intent of contact between key decision makers and staff. It's easy to work only with people with whom one is most comfortable and sometimes be unaware of it. Such visual documentation can bring attention to inappropriate or limited contacts.

8. The Givens

As soon as possible clearly and realistically identify IHE givens regarding program development and implementation. (Areas of concentration available, personnel available, options for credit and modes of deliver, monies to support, etc.) Find out which are immutable and which are negotiable.

9. Decision Making Channels

Openly and honestly define decision making channels. Identify who (person or group) has the power to make certain decisions. People need to know, whether they like it or not.

10. Training in Communication/Problem Solving Skills

Provide training for the PSC, staff and other key participants in communication and problem solving skills. Don't assume they have these skills. Many people don't and everyone can improve. Training can help. Repeat periodically and provide follow up to sessions.

V. LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

11. Project Goals

Identify and document project goals, as defined within the context of the real (as opposed to proposed) environment and review and update regularly. Regardless of how developmental a project is, project goals need to be identified to provide a framework for the operation of the project. Such parameters can be open ended and flexible, accounting for inevitable and often necessary adaptations that frequently occur within the context of the realities of the environment, but some structure and sense of purpose and direction is needed. Documented goals and objectives serve as organizers and important referrent points. Activities and programs can then be consciously related to identified goals.

12. Project Can'ts

In addition to identifying what you hope to do, clearly identify what you can't and won't do and let it be known. Such a step can prevent unrealistic promises being made and the expansion of the project into a giant that is supposed to meet everyone's needs.

13. Roles and Responsibilities and Document

a. Define the roles and responsibilities of project staff to give them room to follow through and let them be accountable. The roles, as goals, may be open ended, but some parameters need to be defined for the sanity of the staff as well as participants.

b. Inform project participants about what the staff is doing and what their roles are, simply and clearly, over and over and over again, written and verbal.



14. Planning

Planning is central to effective implementation of activities/programs. Activities/programs, both short and long range, need to be carefully planned and consciously related to identified goals and objectives. Written plans can help in identifying the necessary sequence of steps and also serve as a reminder and prodder to do them. Staff involvement in the definition of goals, roles and action plans can be a useful device to help staff clearly plan and organize their time and resources in relation to identified goals and objectives. Drawing up specific plans of action, however, is difficult for many people and close to impossible for some. You can't assume people know how to plan. Assistance and follow up may be needed.

15. Communication

Open channels of communication between participating persons and organizations are central to success of most anything. The isolated nature of rural areas only heightens this need. Mechanisms for involving relevant persons in the process of project planning and implementation and for informing persons of what is happening and who is responsible, must be designed, implemented, updated and maintained. Written and verbal, formal and informal means must be established and repeated and consistent attempts made to disseminate information and to provide opportunities for discussion. Communication is the proverbial red herring. People easily feel left out and uninformed and grumble because of it. Many also do little themselves to find out what's happening and use it as an excuse for not getting involved. Regularity is the key.

V. LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

15. Communication - continued

Be sensitive to the language of the people with whom you're working and be careful of the use of jargon. First impressions die hard and one unknown word can make people feel ignorant, set you up as an elitist and put you in the jargonese category.

16. Needs Assessment

Design a needs assessment system that assesses broader district or institution needs, as well as individual needs. The two may or may not overlap. Review existing or previously implemented needs assessments (i.e., right to read, state self-evaluation, etc.) and utilize if possible. Involve persons who will be delivering services in the assessment and incorporate a variety of formal and informal, long and short range tools for determining both needs and wants of all involved groups. Personal one to one dialogue with participants can serve as a powerful tool for assessing individual interests as well as serving a P.R. and communication function which is particularly appropriate and needed at the onset of a project.

17. Consultant Role

Clearly define the role of consultants working in the field. Being a consultant in the field can be stimulating and exciting, as well as intensely frustrating. The freedom from course requirements and the time it potentially offers a consultant for individual work with teachers can be viewed as a great advantage. Unless the role is defined, however, it can be extremely frustrating, (sometimes dysfunctionally so.)



A sense of direction and purpose is necessary for effective use of consultant time and talent, and client needs must be articulated before consultants can then determine whether or not and how they can assist them. The responsibility of doing this belongs to all persons involved, consultants, project staff and school staff. To start, consultants must define for themselves conditions which they can operate within, however open ended or closed they may be. They need to define what they will and will not do. For some, this may mean initially setting up a meeting with interested teachers and school personnel, with the specific purpose of identifying needs, and from this planning specific steps to follow. Others may require teachers to clearly articulate their needs before having anything to do with them. Still others may simply state what they will consider doing and let the teachers decide whether or not they want those services.

Some consultants may decide they will work with teachers in classrooms and others will work only with teachers. One short session may be considered desirable for some consultants and untenable for others, a minimum number of sessions may need to be agreed upon. Parameters such as these can and need to be clearly defined by individual consultants. Project staff, in turn, having worked with teachers and being familiar with the school climate and needs, can facilitate this process by helping to assess needs in advance. And teachers and other school personnel ultimately have the responsibility of defining where and how they need help. Consultant time and talents will be effectively and efficiently utilized only when both client and consultant needs are identified and articulated.

V. LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

17. Consultant Role - continued

If using a consultant for a short time, the need should probably be articulated by the clients. The consultant can then either buy in or out depending on whether or not s/he feels s/he can help. If utilized over a longer time period (usually resulting in longer range influencing,) consultants can diagnose needs themselves and formulate appropriate strategies.

18. Support to Consultants

Provide assistance to IHE personnel delivering services in the field. It's a new role for many, challenging and often uncomfortable. Some people are able to perform effectively in the field, away from the resources, comfort and structure of a University, others are not. Support and training may be needed. Criteria for effective field-based work can be identified and expectations regarding field-based courses made clear.

19. Idle Promises

Don't promise things unless you can deliver them. In isolated regions in particular, where resources are scarce, people don't forget and idle promises lead to disappointments and grumbles.

20. Process/Product Orientation

Balance process with products, and don't lose sight of the product (which may be a structure for a process) at the end of the process! Most people need to see something tangible for their dollars, to reassure them that something is being done.



21. School Schedules

If based in a school, become familiar with the school calendar and follow teachers' schedules. For example, one of the best times to catch teachers is before the students start class, at 7:30 a.m. Adjust to fit their schedules.

22. Intern Feedback

Interns need regular and ongoing constructive feedback. Often this is not recognized by them until the end of an internship. Planned conferences with each intern/supervisor/ and cooperating teacher, in which strengths, areas of growth and next steps or needs are identified and documented by all parties involved, can serve as a useful tool to review progress, strengths, weaknesses and specific next steps in a constructive manner.

23. Inservice Master of Education Program

Don't try to offer an inservice M.Ed. program to full time teachers in two years. Don't succumb to pressures for completion. It's too much in two years on top of a full teaching load and the quality of the program or teaching suffers.

24. Evaluation

Design a constructive and realistic system of formative and summative evaluation and feedback for persons involved in the Project. Such a system can be used as an ongoing management tool and can facilitate staff development and successful achievement of Project outcomes.

V. LEARNINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

24. Evaluation - continued

Allow for time and staff to manage and implement the system. Collection, analysis and documentation of data takes time and personnel.

25. Documentation

Clearly identify what information needs to be documented, why how, and who is responsible (and document your documentation system.) One person simply can not document all that needs to be documented. Documentation, however, is difficult for many people. Many don't know how to document, don't know what to document, and don't want to document. (It means disclosing yourself, plus it's easier for someone else to do it.) Project staff need to be trained to document and specific structured forms for documentation designed.

Writing status or progress reports is another potentially useful, but difficult task. As with documentation, many people don't know how to write a clear review of what they've done and don't want to. If such reports are to be written to serve as vehicles for self evaluation as well as documentation the expectation needs to be made clear, by the director and assistance provided. A set format is probably the most useful.

26. Collaboration

Don't talk collaboration unless you're willing to actually do it and deal with the difficulties (and potential pay offs) inherent in the process. Don't assume people know how to collaborate. Most don't. It's a sophisticated and difficult process which assumes skills and understandings which many people don't possess. Ongoing training can help, along with time and opportunities to try. In addition, concerted ongoing efforts by all involved persons to expand beyond the comfortable linkages with known people must be made if collaboration between persons in diverse role groups is to take place. Collaboration means working with other people who may have conflicting views. It's often not a comfortable process, at least to start. Conscious and sustained efforts are necessary.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *